

LUTHERAN WORLD

**PUBLICATION OF THE
LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION**

DECEMBER

1959

Vol. VI, No. 3

LUTHER'S THEOLOGY OF THE CROSS REGIN PRENTER

**THE THEOLOGICAL BASIS AND NATURE
OF THE LITURGY VILMOS VAJTA**

**THE MINISTRY AND THE MINISTRY
OF WOMEN PETER BRUNNER**

CONTENTS

Luther's Theology of the Cross, by Regin Preter	222
The Theological Basis and Nature of the Liturgy, by Vilmos Vajta	234
The Ministry and the Ministry of Women, by Peter Brunner	247

FROM THE WORK OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION AND THE ECUMENICAL WORLD

<i>World Mission</i>	
Commission on World Mission, July 29-August 6, 1959, by Carl Gustav Diehl . . .	275
The Mission of the Church	277
<i>World Service</i>	
The Year of the Uprooted, by William Dudde	278
<i>Lutheran Publications</i>	
The Areas of Cooperation possible between Lutheran Publishing Houses, by H. Torrey Walker	284
<i>World Presbyterian Alliance</i>	
18th General Council, Sao Paulo, Brazil, by Lewis S. Mudge	287
<i>World Council of Churches</i>	
The Central Committee Meeting at Rhodes, by Hanfried Krüger	289
"Mass Media" and the Ecumenical Movement, by H. W. v. Meyenn	294
Problems of Rapid Social Change, by Peter Heyde	297

FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES

<i>Latin America</i>	
The Mission of the Lutheran Minority Churches in Latin America, by Friedrich Hübner	301
<i>Japan</i>	
One Hundred Years of Protestantism, by Sigurd Aske	305
<i>Germany</i>	
The Development of the Sociology of Religion in Germany, by Justus Freytag	307
<i>Hungary</i>	
The Imperial Charter for the Protestants of Hungary in the Last Century, by Otto Vízner	311

BOOK REVIEWS

Interconfessional Studies (George A. Lindbeck)	315
Theology and Pedagogy (Ingo Baldermann)	320
The Church and Social Ethics (Gunnar Hillerdal)	326
The Century of the Lexikon (Hans Bolewski)	331
The Ancient Church (Peter Fraenkel, Gerhard Delling)	335
Contemporary Crises (T. A. Kantonen, L. G. Terray)	339
EDITORIAL	343
Editorial Notes	345

Supplement: *Literature Survey* for December, 1959

LUTHERAN WORLD

PUBLICATION OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Vol. VI, No. 3

December, 1959

ASSUME that man has now fully brought about "the elimination of the self-subsisting suprasensual world," and that the principles and the ideals which have characterized man in any way, to any extent, no longer exist. His true vis-à-vis, which, unlike principles and ideals, cannot be described as It, but can be addressed and reached as Thou, may be eclipsed for man during the process of elimination; yet this vis-à-vis lives intact behind the wall of darkness. Man may even do away with the name "god," which after all implies a possessive, and which, if the possessor rejects it, i.e., if there is no longer a "God of man," has lost its *raison d'être*: yet He who is denoted by the name lives in the light of His eternity. But we, "the slayers," remain dwellers in darkness, consigned to death.

According to a Jewish legend, Adam and Eve, when they rejected God on the day of their creation and were driven out of the Garden, saw the sun set for the first time. They were terrified, for they could interpret this phenomenon only as a sign that the world was to sink back into chaos because of their guilt. Both of them wept, sitting face to face, the whole night through, and they underwent a change of heart. Then morning dawned. Adam rose, caught a unicorn, and offered it as a sacrifice in place of himself.

MARTIN BUBER

Luther's Theology of the Cross

REGIN PRENTER

THERE HAS ALWAYS BEEN a theology of the cross, both before and after Luther, and it has found expression in numerous ways, such as those of St. Paul in the New Testament, St. Augustine in the ancient church, St. Bernhard in the Middle Ages, and Kierkegaard in the modern age. What, then, is unique about Luther's theology of the cross? Let us turn to Luther himself!

Although the fact had long since been established, the term "theology of the cross," *theologia crucis*, appears in Luther's thought for the first time in his lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews (1517-18), in the so-called commentary to chap. 12, v. 11: "Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

Luther comments on this verse:

These antitheses appear often in the Scriptures: judgment and righteousness, anger and mercy, death and life, evil and good. And these are the great works of the Lord: "He performs a strange work in order that he might accomplish his real work." In this unusual fashion, according to Psalm 4, he satisfies the conscience: "Thou hast enlarged me when I was in distress; have mercy upon me and hear my prayer." This is the outpouring of grace, which is described in Romans 5: "And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience experience; and experience, hope: and hope maketh not ashamed." This is the theology of the cross of which the apostle says: "But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumbling block and unto the Greeks foolishness." For it is completely hidden from their eyes.¹

Already in his earlier thought, Luther regarded the theology of the cross not merely as one part of theology but as theology in her totality, that is, in so far as she is at all capable of understanding the unity underlying the antitheses in the divine works, that is, God's righteousness under his judgment, his grace under his anger, the life which he bestows even in the midst of death, his power to turn the present evil into a thing of good, or, as Luther expresses it in his own special vocabulary: "God's real work must be understood through his strange work." Such a theology is both a stumbling block to the pious (the Jews) and utter foolishness to the wise (the Greeks), for it suggests a transvaluation of all values. The opposite of the theology of the cross is a theology of glory (*theologia gloriae*) a theology of the natural man to whom the cross and the true valuation which it involves is something entirely foreign. "A theology of glory calls evil good and good evil; a theology of the cross calls the thing what it actually is," as we read

¹ Luther's *Vorlesung über den Hebräerbrief*, edited by E. Hirsch and H. Rückert. Published 1929. pp. 85-86.

in the 21st thesis of the *Heidelberg Disputation* (April, 1518). The exposition of this thesis goes on:

This is clear: he (the theologian of glory) who does not know Christ, does not know God hidden in suffering. Therefore he prefers works to suffering, glory to the cross, strength to weakness, wisdom to folly, and, in general, good to evil. These are the people whom the apostle calls "enemies of the cross of Christ" (Phil. 3:18), for they hate the cross and suffering and love works and the glory of works. Thus they call the good of the cross evil and the evil of a deed good. God can be found only in suffering and the cross, as has already been said. Therefore the friends of the cross say that the cross is good and works are evil, for through the cross works are dethroned and the old Adam, who is especially edified by works, is crucified. It is impossible for a person not to be puffed up by his good works unless he has first been deflated and destroyed by suffering and evil until he knows that he is worthless and that his works are not his but God's.²

So much for Luther himself. There is an immeasurable wealth of material here which represents the mature position of Luther, and not just his early thought as he stood close to the monastic piety of the Middle Ages. Luther's God is the God who reveals himself in the cross of Christ, God hidden in suffering. His revelation is at the same time a veiling, for his entire divine majesty lies hidden under the suffering and shame of the crucifixion. Only that person is righteous before this hidden God who has taken the cross upon himself and no longer claims a righteousness based on his own works. This cross upon which our works are shattered is not one which we have "chosen" ourselves, as in so many forms of medieval mysticism. If it were so, even the bearing of it would have become a good work. No, that cross before which we and all our works are counted as nothing comes to us through the trials and temptations of our own lives, and precisely because it comes over us and is not chosen by us, the cross we are called upon to bear is in a mysterious way identical with the cross of Christ. God lays his cross upon us for our salvation; the sinner is crucified that the new justified man may arise. Here we catch a glimpse of that which is new and unique in Luther's theology of the cross in contrast to those of the Middle Ages. In the "Imitation of Christ" of the Middle Ages, the cross of Christ was not as such identical with ours, but was the example after which the lives of men were to be patterned. Luther, however, did not consider the cross of Christ primarily as the supreme example of humility which we are called upon to imitate, instead it was that act by which Christ endured the actual punishment for our sin. For this reason his cross is identical with ours, because he bore our punishment upon the cross.

Therefore the statement: "God revealed himself in the cross of Christ" has a double meaning. In the first place it means: "The love of God toward sinners is only recognizable in the love with which the Son of God took upon himself the punishment for all our sins upon the cross." Secondly it means: "This love of

² Cf. Luther's Works (American edition, published 1957), vol. 31, p. 53.

God, which is manifested in the cross, is only appropriated by us in so far as we are willing to take up our own cross. Since Christ actually bore our punishment upon his cross, and since his cross is in the last analysis identical with ours, to hate our own cross is at the same time to hate his, and to love his cross is at the same time to love our own." This mysterious identity of the cross of Jesus Christ on Golgotha with our own is the essential element in Luther's theology, and it radically puts an end to any idea of an "imitation of the crucified one" as a good work, or a pious exercise. The theology of the cross, according to which the cross in my own life destroys all my self-righteousness so that I am judged solely in the light of Christ's action on my behalf, through which alone I am made righteous before God, is identical with the main Lutheran doctrine of the justification of sinners through faith alone. The faith which justifies is in essence itself a bearing of the cross, as we read in this 21st *Heidelberg Thesis* because it demands that the sinner surrender every claim to self-justification and fly instead for refuge to the cross whereon Christ suffered on our behalf. If we turn the sequence around we can also say: the Lutheran doctrine of the justification through faith alone is identical with Luther's theology of the cross, since only through faith is the sinner declared righteous by God, in that God truly, that is, through his word and works, judges and acquits him. When so formulated the identity between the doctrine of justification by faith and Luther's theology of the cross is of special significance today.

For the church which is called into existence by that word of God which judges and acquits has often slipped into the habit of talking about the cross in such a manner that no actual deed of God toward us is transmitted through its preaching. What results is the "cheap grace" which Dietrich Bonhoeffer so severely critized in his *The Cost of Discipleship*. The genuine theology of the word and of faith, as it finds expression in the doctrine of justification by faith, has always been a theology of the cross for Luther, because the righteousness of God is spoken to us in the *word* and is accepted as our own by faith *in* the word.

Let us try to sum up these facts in three short sentences: 1) the content of the word about the cross is always the historical cross of Jesus Christ, upon which he bore in our stead the punishment for our sins and, in so doing, is and remains our only righteousness before God. 2) The form which the proclamation of this word about the cross must take is characterized by an inner connection between its content and the work of our own cross. 3) The reception of this word about the cross, the faith which justifies, combines within itself the hearing of the word about the cross and the acceptance of the form in which it is proclaimed, that is, the faith which justifies unites trust in the proclamation of the cross of Christ as our only righteousness before God with our willing acceptance of our own cross. In like manner the corresponding doctrine of justification by faith, according to which the believer is made righteous before God without any effort on his part but out of pure grace, through the cross, can be summed up similarly: 1) its content is the historical cross of Christ; 2) its proclamation of the cross of Christ

is always in combination with the work of the individual crosses of men, and 3) it points to the crucifixion of all human sin and self-justification.

When we in this way relate the word and the faith to the inseparable union between the cross of Christ and that which is laid upon us, then we arrive at a theology of the word and of faith, which differs in much the same way from a medieval theology of the cross without the word as it does from a post-reformation theology of the word without the cross. When we attempt to state these differences a little more sharply, then we discover the challenge which Luther's theology of the cross puts to us today.

I know that I am somewhat over-simplifying the matter when I, without further qualification, talk about a medieval "theology of the cross without the word." Nevertheless, a very important distinction comes to the surface through this over-simplification. The act of bearing one's cross in the medieval "imitation" piety was above all a form of pious exercise. One attempted through a humble carrying of one's cross to prepare oneself in a dutiful manner for the outpouring of the unmerited grace of God, upon which the salvation of man directly depends. This piety in a very particular way lacked the word, that is, it ignored the gracious approach of God to the sinner through the gospel. The individual was called upon to prepare himself as well as he possibly could for the coming of the unmerited grace of God, by imitating the humble manner in which Jesus carried his cross. But precisely because this cross-bearing was something apart from the cross of Christ which according to the gospel was freely given in order to affect our righteousness, and was regarded instead as a necessary pious exercise in preparation for the unmerited grace of God, such an imitation became an impossible task which inevitably resulted either in hypocrisy or in doubt as the monk Martin Luther discovered in his own bitter experience. On the other hand, the post-reformation Lutheran theology quickly accustomed itself to separating Luther's theology of the cross from his theology of the word and began so to preach the word about the cross that it no longer had anything to do with the cross of the individual and did not have as its goal the actual crucifying of the old Adam. The consequence was a theology of the word without the cross. The word about the cross became an "objective doctrine," it lost its character as a word which not only teaches something about the cross, but which actually works as the cross in connection with the cross in our own lives. Faith, then, became the intellectual affirmation of this objective doctrine of the word; it also lost its character as a cross, that is, it no longer meant the real destruction of all individual righteousness.

It was no longer seen with the necessary clarity that once the word about the historical cross of Jesus is separated from our own cross, the whole comfort of the gospel that Christ bore the punishment for our sins is made problematic. And furthermore, when faith in the cross of Christ no longer involves the willingness to carry one's own cross, then the Crucifixion is no longer taken seriously as that event by which Christ bore the punishment for our sins. For if I do not

want to acknowledge my own sins and God's judgment over them in that I accept the cross and suffering which is laid upon me in my life without bitterness and in a spirit of faith, as something which I have justly earned, how, then, can I acknowledge Jesus Christ as he who took upon himself the punishment for these very sins of mine and thereby has become my one and only claim to righteousness before God? Luther was absolutely right, when in the *Heidelberg Theses* he, on the one hand, rejected the attempt to turn the acceptance of suffering and the daily cross into a form of work-righteousness, and on the other, identified the acceptance of the cross and suffering with faith in Christ.

Even today, any attempt to reinterpret Luther's theology of the cross must still travel the narrow road between a "theology of the cross without the word" and a "theology of the word without the cross," but these two errors do not take on the same form as in earlier centuries.

A theology of the cross without the word as was common in the "imitation" piety of medieval mysticism scarcely exists in the contemporary evangelical theology of preaching. Its modern counterpart is found, however, in the concept of an "existentialist theology." Let us take, for example, a quotation from Rudolf Bultmann's famous work *New Testament and Mythology*. When he speaks of the cross of Jesus Christ as a saving act he says:

By giving up Jesus to be crucified, God has set up the cross for us. To believe in the cross of Christ does not mean to concern ourselves with a mythical process wrought outside of us and our world, or with an objective event turned by God to our advantage, but rather to make the cross of Christ our own, and to undergo crucifixion with him.³

Here the alternative to the "not" is a "but". According to the author one must choose between one of two ways in which to understand the cross of Christ. Faith is, he says, *not* a looking back to an objective tangible event of the past (this is how it is expressed in a sentence which follows: "it (the cross) is not an event of the past, which can be contemplated"), *but* it is acceptance of the cross of Christ in one's own existence. Through this existentialist understanding of faith, the whole historical content or the historical basis for faith is made irrelevant. It is not openly said that there is no objective tangible history of salvation, but it is implied, that the historicity of these saving acts, that is, the fact that they occurred in the past, is of no significance to faith. They achieve significance only in the act of proclamation, when the hearer sees in them a particular possible existence, namely that of the crucified one, and chooses it as his own existence possibility. This is what is meant by the words: "taking the cross of Christ for one's own." This whole conception of the meaning of the cross for salvation is very closely related to the medieval "imitation" piety. For the important thing here is no longer the once-for-all historical crucifixion in which Jesus suffered in our stead and bore our guilt and punishment, so that we might be declared right-

³ *Kerygma and Myth*. Edited by Hans Werner Bartsch, p. 36. Published 1953, by SPCK, London.

eous before God for all eternity. Of this act of redemption Bultmann says only the following:

It (the cross) has a mythical character as far as its objective setting is concerned. The Jesus who was crucified was the pre-existent, incarnate son of God, and as such he was without sin. He is the victim whose blood atones for our sins. He bears vicariously the sin of the world, and by enduring the punishment for sin on our behalf he delivers us from death. This mythological interpretation is a hotch-potch of sacrificial and juridical analogies, which have ceased to be tenable for us today.

The idea of vicarious suffering is completely eliminated and is replaced by discipleship. Once the emphasis upon the historical crucifixion is eliminated the gospel ceases to be the word of God to us whereby we are declared righteous through this historical event. The existentialist theological interpretation is the modern version of a theology of the cross without the word. The fact that existentialist theology and preaching often refer to the "word of God" and to the "proclamation" does not alter the situation at all. In the existentialist interpretation, the "word of God" is no longer the apostolic gospel, which in the name of God bestows salvation to the believer through these historical acts, but is merely the presentation of a particular possibility of existence, an understanding of existence, which functions only as a challenge to the individual to choose this form of existence as his own existence possibility and thus to understand himself in this light rather than in some other way. Once more let us quote from this famous writing of Bultmann's: "the preaching of the cross as the event of redemption challenges all who hear it to appropriate this significance for themselves, to be willing to be crucified with Christ."⁴ Consequently the forgiveness of sins is also existentially interpreted. It is no longer the divine gift of righteousness through Jesus Christ. Instead Bultmann says:

It is quite clear from this that forgiveness of sins is not a juridical concept. It does not mean the remission of punishment. If that were so, man's plight would be as bad as ever. Rather, forgiveness conveys freedom from sin, which hitherto had held man in bondage. But this freedom is not a static quality; it is freedom to obey. The indicative implies an imperative. Love is the fulfillment of the law, and therefore the forgiveness of God delivers man from himself and makes him free to devote his life to the service of others (Rom. 13:8-10; Gal. 5:14).⁵

In this interpretation of the forgiveness of sins the accent falls upon the consequences of being forgiven, on the freedom to love, which emphasis is foreign to both the New Testament and the Reformers, for here the forgiveness itself is no longer understood as effected because the one who forgives bears the guilt of those who stand in need of forgiveness.

I have gone into such detail concerning the existentialist theology and interpretation of the proclamation of the gospel because it is widespread today and presents a very special temptation to the church. Here the scandal aroused by

⁴ *ibid.*, p. 35.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 37.

the historical tradition of the New Testament gospel with its factual errors and mythological conceptions which appear somewhat irrelevant to the contemporary age seems to have been overcome in principal. The whole weight seems to rest on the act of appropriating the cross for one's own life. All fantastic, objective conceptions of God are here expurgated, and a purely spiritualized interpretation is presented. Furthermore, everything seems to coincide so beautifully with Luther's theology of the cross, for he also stressed that faith in the cross of Jesus Christ is very closely bound up with the will to bear one's own cross.

And yet this very popular modern variation of the theology of the cross stands in fundamental opposition to that of Luther. For the former, despite everything, is a theology of the cross without the word, because it no longer needs the fundamental message that Christ was once and for all time crucified on our behalf. For this reason it is possible today to hear the forgiveness of sins proclaimed in evangelical sermons which do not even hint at its basis in the historical event of reconciliation. At the same time the Lord's Supper is interpreted without any attempt to clarify the relationship between the forgiveness of sins and the real presence. This indifference to both the historical act of reconciliation and the real presence in the sacrament point to the same tendency; the cross as a form of personal existence has become sufficient, and the cross as an historical vicarious act is no longer regarded as essential. The entire importance depends on whether or not the individual makes the cross of Christ his own.

But here one finds a direct contradiction to both Luther's theology of the cross as well as to his doctrine of the justification by faith. A theology of the cross, which today wishes to learn something from that of Luther must begin to take very seriously the message of the historical crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ as that act by which God imputes righteousness to us for all time and eternity; a "strange righteousness" in the fullest sense of the word, which gives us the freedom to become the children of God, a freedom which not only sets us free from the impossible task of trying to justify ourselves, but which makes us free to love God and to serve our neighbor. Only because this freedom has been given to us by the historical act of Christ on our behalf are we able even to think about making the cross of Christ our own. Without this freedom every attempt to make the cross of Christ our own would only lead us into doubt, resulting inevitably in death and damnation. And herein lurks the particular danger for any modern theology of the cross which is patterned after existentialist theology, namely, that cross-bearing might become something of an existentialist mode of life. Certainly this is not the intention of Bultmann and his followers, but one must raise the question whether the elimination of the historical act of redemption in connection with such a strong emphasis upon the acceptance of one's own cross does not lead to a so-called "existence detached from the world." And when the bearing of the cross is defined in this way as an existential possibility without the redeeming power of the historical crucifixion of Jesus, the danger exists that cross-bearing will become some kind of ideal, deriving its content in the main from

modern existentialist philosophy. It is characteristic of the theological seriousness and the personal honesty of Rudolph Bultmann that he himself, in all sharpness, formulated the most decisive critique against his whole theology as the question whether or not it is possible to realize the existential character of the Christian faith without Christ, on a purely humanistic basis. But a secularized faith existence is no longer the bearing of the cross of Jesus Christ, even when it completely disengages itself from all that is tangible and available in this world and lives completely out of the unknown future. One could not begin to think about bearing one's own cross, which in this connection means accepting it as the cross of Christ, without first having tasted the freedom of being a child of God, which frees one from the curse of having to make oneself righteous before God, even though one were to attempt to exist on a faith totally detached from this world. We must never forget what an unheard of boldness it is, to identify our own cross with that of Christ. When we consider the events of the passion, for example, it is almost blasphemy to mention our crosses in the same breath with that of Christ. It is certainly no foregone conclusion that such a thing should even be allowed, and it is only allowed because of the freedom which the child of God enjoys, given to us as a gift through our acceptance in faith of that redemptive act of Jesus Christ in which he suffered vicariously the punishment for our sins.

Perhaps it is extremely difficult for the modern man even to understand the concept of this vicarious redemptive act, to say nothing of making it his own. But without this act of redemption as its basis, every theology of the cross is nothing more than idle phantasy.

A theology of the word without the cross, which reduces the whole gospel to a doctrine which can be affirmed in a purely intellectual manner can also scarcely be found today, but it is still open to debate whether a modern-day equivalent does not exist in much the same manner as that for the theology of the cross without the word of which I spoke earlier. There has been a rediscovery of Luther's theology of the cross in our century precisely in those countries where the church must fight against a totalitarian state. We again know something about a church under the cross.

But precisely in this situation the danger exists, paradoxically, that the theology of the cross may give way to the predominance of a theology of the word without the cross. For where the church, as is the case in our modern secularized world, exists within the context of a strange, yes, perhaps even hostile world, she is always in danger of withdrawing into herself.

Certainly this does not deny that there are men and women in such a church who bravely face persecution and martyrdom and in this sense are bearing the cross of Christ. Despite this, the temptation to erect a theology of the word without the cross is extremely great in this modern world. Just as the existentialist theologians have arrived at a theology of the cross without the word, not by ignoring the word completely but by reinterpreting it in terms of the so-called existentialist interpretation which has "demythologized" and "dehistoricized" it until

it has become a watered-down presentation of a genuine form of existence, so the theology of the word, which I have described as a theology without the cross, is characterized by the fact that it does not simply ignore the cross, but reinterprets it.

It was decisive for Luther's theology that the proclamation of the historical crucifixion of Jesus Christ was seen in relationship to the effect of the cross which the individual experiences in his daily life. The judgment, which is proclaimed in the cross of Jesus Christ, and the judgment, which is experienced through one's own cross, cannot be separated from each other. Furthermore, the freedom from the guilt of sin which is proclaimed in the cross of Jesus Christ cannot be separated from the freedom to praise God and to serve one's neighbor which is experienced through one's own cross. Therefore Luther's theology of the cross radically rejected any kind of thinking and acting in two different realms, if we may use an expression of Bonhoeffer's.

Or to express it in another way: Luther's theology of the cross conformed to a fundamental trinitarian thought pattern. God the Father, the Creator, God the Son, the Redeemer, God the Holy Ghost, the Savior is revealed in the cross and effects our salvation through it. For this reason providence, redemption and salvation all stand under the sign of the cross. The Holy Spirit, who conforms our faith and our whole life to the cross, does it by leading us to the Son, who effected our redemption with the Father, and thus to the Father, who in his providence has made us one with his crucified Son. In this way, the walls which we often erect between the sphere of the church or religion, wherein we seek to imprison the cross, and the sphere of the world, are torn down. This is essential to Luther's theology of the cross. The theology of the cross which originated out of his monastic piety inevitably led him out of the monastery, for the true cross was no longer the self-chosen one of monastic life, but the suffering and the temptations to which God the Creator exposes man in the daily routine of life whatever his class or profession. For the mature Luther, the place at which the cross manifests itself in life is no longer the exercise of ascetic piety and the unscrupulous temptations in the confessional as in the pre-Reformation monastic days, but in daily service to one's neighbor. The theology of the cross according to Luther demands the radical rejection of any division of the world into two realms—the sacred and the secular.

Our modern orthodoxy, as it is molded by the *kirchenkampf* and the experiences of our generation, coupled with an energetic study of the Holy Scriptures and the writings of the Reformation, is tempted to fall into this kind of a two-realm pattern of viewing the world. The impressive and, in essence, correct theology and preaching, which we have built up over the last few decades, or one should say, sought to rediscover by the study of the Scriptures and the Reformers, appears, unfortunately, to have great difficulty in reaching people living in today's world, and, furthermore, even in addressing us, in so far as we live a secular life outside of the church and theology. Our present orthodoxy is not succeeding in

its attempt to relate the cross of Jesus Christ to the experience of modern man. It appears as if the cross of Christ and our own cross belong only to a sacred world. We may preach constructively about it, but the historical reality of modern life seems to be a totally different realm from that in which the word about the cross fits, which consequently becomes something of a religious ideal, a theology of the word without the cross, not because it seeks to deny the cross, but because it no longer bears a living relationship to the cross in our daily existence. Such preaching about the cross has no message for the modern world.

In theology, this two-realm theory finds expression through a remarkable coupling of the first article of the Creed with a one-sided concentration upon the second. This can be seen, for example, in that theology which has been influenced by Karl Barth, where everything is seen as "*Christologie*." One even speaks of a christological basis for the state. It is possible that bad experiences with a false doctrine of creation have led to this one-sided christological emphasis in German theology, but it is an unhealthy theology which, because of its fear of a false doctrine of the creation, neglects the true biblical message of creation or reduces it to christology. Through such a theology the two-realm theory wins uncritical support.

But as long as we are not prepared to carry on a trinitarian theology of the cross in the full sense of the word—and under theology I do not mean only professional academic theology or theological research, but also the proclamation of the church, just as Luther's theology of the cross was no merely academic matter—we shall not be able to bring about the proper identification of the proclamation of the historical cross of Christ with the cross in our own life which was so essential to Luther's theology. We are no longer accustomed to speak, directly and without qualifications, about God's rule over our lives under the sign of the cross. When anyone talks about God's actions in history in as natural a manner as Luther did we fear a "natural theology." And we have so accustomed ourselves to the modern pattern of thought, that it strikes us as almost inconceivable that history can be something else than human history, that is, than history which exclusively has responsible free man as its subject. There is no more room for God in history. Our world and our history have become godless, and our God has no world and no history. So now we have arrived at the point where the only history which we still ascribe to God is the so-called history of salvation, the history of the second article, which implies a restriction upon the first article, as if God is no longer Lord of the secular history, but only of the history of salvation.

If we compare our way of speaking about God and history with that of Luther, we can immediately notice the difference. In his exposition of *The Magnificat* Luther says:

For this reason God has also imposed death on us all and laid the cross of Christ together with countless sufferings and afflictions upon his beloved children and Christians. In fact, sometimes he even lets us fall into sin, in order that he may look into the depths even more, bring help to many, perform manifold works, show himself a true Creator, and thereby

make himself known and worthy of love and praise... He also cast his only and well beloved son Christ into the depths of all woe and showed in him most plainly to what end his seeing, work, help, method, counsel, and will are directed. Therefore, having most fully experienced all these things, Christ abounds through all eternity in the knowledge, love, and praise of God....⁶

Here Luther's theology of the cross includes a theology of history and of the creation. Luther sees the creative work of God in close connection with his redemptive work in Jesus Christ the crucified. He knows nothing of the modern division between the theology of the first article and that of the second.

To be sure Luther does recognize a distinction between the ways God acts in history, between that work which he does through natural means and which concerns all men, and that which he accomplishes through his own arm, and which concerns only those who have faith. About these he says:

He lets the godly to become powerless and to be brought low, until everyone supposes their end is near, whereas in these very things He is present to them with all His power, yet so hidden and in secret that even those who suffer the oppression do not feel it but only believe. There is the fullness of God's power and His outstretched arm. For where man's strength ends, God's strength begins, provided faith is present and waits on Him. And when the oppression comes to an end, it becomes manifest what great strength was hidden under the weakness. Even so, Christ was powerless on the cross; and yet there He performed His mightiest work and conquered sin, death, world, hell, devil and all evil. Thus all the martyrs were strong and overcame. Thus, too, all who suffer and are oppressed overcome.⁷

It is simply astounding how radically Luther rejects the two-realm way of thinking. When in his exposition of *The Magnificat* he talks, for example, about faith and prayer, he refers not to a sacred sphere, but to this earthly life and he describes proper prayer in an unusually bold manner:

You must feel the pinch of poverty in the midst of your hunger and learn by experience what hunger and poverty are, with no provision on hand and no help in yourself or any other man, but in God only; so that the work may be God's alone and impossible to be done by any other. You must not only think and speak of a low estate but actually come to be in a low estate and caught in it, without any human aid, so that God alone may do the work.... We are Christians and have the gospel, which neither the devil nor men can abide, in order that we may come into poverty and lowliness and God may thereby have His work in us.⁸

Luther is not speaking here about spiritual hunger and thirst, but about actual physical hunger and thirst, and he says that we come to hunger and thirst through the gospel so that God can do his work.

How do we come to identify the cross in the creation as the cross of Jesus Christ? Can we go along with this at all? And if not, must we then not admit that Luther's theology of the cross is not relevant for us?

⁶ *ibid.*, p. 32.

⁷ Luther's Works (American edition, published 1956), vol. 21, p. 301.

⁸ *ibid.*, p. 340.

I will not go so far as to say that Luther's theology of the cross is completely irrelevant to us. I do believe, however, that it will have no meaning for us unless we acquire a new understanding of our daily life and take it seriously as both the gift and the judgment of God. Then it will become something more than just edifying talk when we say that Jesus Christ bore the guilt and punishment for our sins upon the cross. As we in the course of our own lives experience the punishment for our fall into sin, through suffering, through temptation, through death, it will become clear to us that, because he bore exactly the same on our behalf, because he, who possessed the power of divine love as no other human person lived and suffered for us—this all is no longer guilt and punishment for us, but the role of the children of God, which is permitted us through the gracious command of God in the gospel. But as long as we in our own conscience do not experience the guilt and death of life earnestly as the punishment of the Creator who gives us life, the preaching about the reconciliation which was affected by the cross of Christ remains a statement whose meaning we do not really understand.

But how shall we learn to take our daily earthly life seriously in such a way that the reality of guilt and death becomes a genuine experience of the Creator's wrath? I believe that we can in no way guarantee it; we possess no theological or homiletical method in order to bring this about. We can only do one thing: we must concern ourselves for both life and the word of God with like honesty and determination, so that we neither play life against the word, as is the case in a theology of the cross without the word; nor play the word against life as is the case in all sorts of thinking in terms of two realms such as occurs in the orthodoxy entrenched in the church. For God is the trinitarian God. He is the God of life, the Creator; he is the God of the word, the Savior; he is the God of faith, the Holy Ghost, and this trinity as Father, in our common experience of life; as Son, in the preached word; and as Holy Ghost, in our personal convictions, teaches us in the last analysis what it means: *Omnia bona in cruce et sub cruce abscondita sunt*. (All good things are hidden in and under the cross.)⁹ Therefore they cannot be understood anywhere else except under the cross; under the cross—that means, under the cross on which Jesus, our Redeemer, bore our punishment, and under the cross which my Creator has laid upon me in my suffering and in my death. For in both places we are talking about the same cross. But a cross which is either only objective (outside of us) or only subjective (personal to us) is not the cross of Christ which is the means of our salvation. The deep truth of Luther's theology of the cross is that it views the cross on Golgotha and the cross which is laid upon us as one and the same. Is there not wisdom in this old truth for our own teaching and life?

⁹ *ibid.*, p. 347-348.

The Theological Basis and Nature of the Liturgy

VILMOS VAJTA

THE QUESTION OF LITURGY is very vital to the life of the Lutheran Church, for in the liturgy the Christian congregation celebrates the public worship of God.¹ In its decision to accept a true form of worship and to reject one which is false, the congregation decides for or against God; it receives or rejects the fellowship which God offers.² In the last analysis, the question of liturgy is a question of faith. If it were not so, it would mean either that the congregation has denied its God-given existence or that the liturgy has become something which is no longer determined by this existence.³

I

There is no end to the claims that the church of the Reformation was not interested in liturgy. One need not go quite as far as one of the founders of the liturgical movement in the Roman Church who described Protestantism as an "anti-liturgical heresy."⁴ Even now the opinion is often expressed in our own circles that Luther himself "was disinterested in liturgy, that he basically showed no understanding for the cult and the liturgy" etc.⁵

When such opinions are encountered, one can only ask with surprise: what actually is meant here by "liturgy" or the "liturgical"? Is not our own church endangered by the opinion that the Reformation can give us no counsel for our revival of liturgical interest? It is then only one short step till sources which are nourished by other theological views prove themselves to be liturgically more fruitful than the evangelical sources. Therefore it is important in this situation that the Lutheran Church's search for a true form of worship and therewith also for a true liturgy be stressed as a decisive question for the life of the church.

A church cannot exist without liturgy. The liturgy is the form in which the congregation receives God's word in word and sacrament, and in which it, at the same time, clothes its prayers, its praise, and its confession of faith.⁶ Therefore the Lutheran Church, by her very nature, is deeply interested in liturgy, perhaps much more so than those churches which are generally regarded as the "liturgical" churches. For the Lutheran Church, the reflections concerning the liturgy are intimately connected with the question of the form of the gospel,

¹ Under liturgy we understand here the form and the order in which the Christian congregation celebrates the worship which is due her God.

² Vilmos Vajta: *Theologie des Gottesdienstes*. 2nd edition. Göttingen, 1954. P. 17 ff.

³ See Luther's concluding words to the *Deutsche Messe*, 1526. WA 19, 113.

⁴ Dom Guéranger from Solesmes, the founder of the liturgical movement which spread from this Benedictine Monastery, espouses this view among others in a basic work *Institutions liturgiques* 1-4, Paris-Brussels 1878-85.

⁵ See Vilmos Vajta, *ibid.* P. XVI, especially footnote 9, where further examples are given.

⁶ For the definition of the word liturgy in the evangelical sense see the article on liturgy in *Nordisk Teologisk Oppslagsbok*, Vol. II, Lund-Köbenhavn 1955, p. 820 f.

that is, with the question of salvation. Where liturgy is not so conceived, we encounter false "liturgism" rather than a genuine "liturgical interest." This perspective of the Lutheran Church is decisive. Here the necessity for liturgy is theologically grounded, which enables the church to distinguish between false and true manifestations which lay claim to being liturgy.

With this we have reached our theme. It is a very timely theme, for we can certainly concur in one point, namely, that within the Lutheran Church today there is a very definite and lively liturgical interest.⁷ In all of the Lutheran churches throughout the world, we are experiencing thorough-going liturgical revivals which are one manifestation of the revival of liturgical interest in Christendom, as such.⁸

II

Theology and Liturgy

Our reflections will begin with the liturgical grounds for, and definitions of, liturgy.

For our present liturgical understanding, it is necessary to stress again and again the close connection between theology and liturgy. There may have been times when this connection was not always clearly seen, but this could not alter the fact that in reality theological thought often found its refutation in the liturgy. Theology can also unconsciously influence the liturgical life of the church, for the liturgical order in which the church celebrates her worship is always an expression of her theological position. Since the influence of theology is often rather late in the life of the church, the situation does occur where an error is preserved in the liturgy, which has long since been corrected in the theology. On the other hand, the liturgy has often preserved the correct doctrine when the theology wandered down the wrong path. Today we are in the situation where a revival of biblical Reformation theology very consciously helps us to see and to think through the practical problems of liturgical development.

The history of Christian worship witnesses to the intimate relationship between the development of the church's doctrine and her liturgy. For Luther, for example, the contention against the worship-life of the Middle Ages and the subsequent Reformation in this area grew out of an inner-theological necessity.⁹ It is sufficient merely to point out how this Reformation perspective worked itself out both in Luther's order of worship and in the decades directly following him.¹⁰ No one acquainted with the history of liturgy and of doctrine would question the

⁷ A survey of the liturgical movement in Germany can be found in K. F. Müller: *Die Neuordnung des Gottesdienstes in Theologie und Kirche* (in *Theologie und Liturgie*), ed. by L. Henning, Kassel, 1952; *Die Agendenarbeit in den Landeskirchen der Evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von 1945-1956* in the same place; Chr. Mahrenholz: *Die Agende für evangelisch-lutherische Kirchen und Gemeinden, Vol. I* (in *Jahrbuch für Liturgie und Hymnologie*, 1957)—for the Scandinavian countries in NTU, p. 838 ff.; and in the U.S. in George R. Saltzer: *The New Liturgy*, in *Lutheran Theological Quarterly* 1953, p. 3 ff.

⁸ In this connection see, particularly, the report of the liturgical commission of the Lutheran World Federation 1952-1957, Geneva 1957, and the report on the Order of the Main Worship Service in the Evangelical Lutheran Church worked out along the same lines.

⁹ This I have tried to show in my above mentioned work.

¹⁰ Th. Knoll: *Luthers Reform der Abendmahlsfeier in ihrer konstitutiven Bedeutung* (in *Schrift und Bekenntnis*), Hamburg-Berlin, 1950, and L. Fendt: *Der lutherische Gottesdienst des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Munich, 1923.

assertion that orthodoxy, pietism, the Enlightenment and liberalism, as well as the Lutheran confessionalism of the last century have all exercised a profound influence upon the liturgy.

This exchange between theology and liturgy is still valid in our present-day liturgical efforts, a fact which must be re-emphasised, especially since there are those who are endeavoring to bring about an inter-confessional ecumenical exchange in the field of liturgy. Where such an exchange even crosses over the border to the Roman Church with astonishing theological carelessness, a warning signal must be set up. It must first be proved whether a truly evangelical treasure will be gained or whether the way will be prepared for a non-evangelical theology through the adoption of seemingly impressive liturgical forms.¹¹ Therefore it is very essential to clarify the theological grounds upon which a liturgical form is to be initiated. One cannot avoid the impression that many a liturgical acquisition which in the evangelical sense is harmless, has nevertheless become suspect, precisely because it was espoused by people who appear to lack the necessary theological clarity.¹²

I am thoroughly convinced that the contemporary revival of interest in biblical and Reformation theology can already advance our understanding of liturgy. Only when based on such a theological revival can our liturgical efforts be successful and find acceptance. Luther and the Reformation will not disappoint us in this fundamental theological quest. If anyone affirms the contrary, he should earnestly check whether he is still being true to the gospel. Naturally, the theology of the Reformation does not have an answer for every single question which concerns us in our present struggle to arrive at a genuinely evangelical theology of worship,¹³ but this in no way implies that we can merely bypass the theological positions of our Lutheran Church. They have something important to say to our present-day liturgical efforts and if we do not listen to them we shall be in danger of losing the gospel and therewith also a genuine liturgy.

Assuming that we agree upon the intimate connection between theology and liturgy, there is then still something further which must be said. It concerns the following insight: The theological foundation must always be laid first, then the problem of the liturgical forms can be dealt with.¹⁴ Where this primary rule of liturgical life is not obeyed, the danger of ritualism occurs. When the theology behind worship has first been thoroughly thought through

¹¹ See here Vilmos Vajta: *Liturgi—på evangelisk mark*, Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift, 1959, p. 55 ff.

¹² A typical example of this was the controversy over the practice of elevating the elements in the "High Mass" in Sweden in 1950-51. As the high church movement, motivated by the doctrine of the real presence, which was presented in categories colored by Thomism, tried to reintroduce the practice of elevation, which had been forbidden since 1593, theological objections were raised against it, in which the following position was expressed, that—although the elevation in itself is adiafora—it could not be reintroduced with the above mentioned motivations. See the article by Sven Kjällström: *Elevationen och korstecknet*, Svensk Teologisk Kvartalskrift, 1950, p. 286 ff. and the following fervent discussion in *Svensk Kyrkotidning* 1951.

¹³ For this reason the attempt to continue the work on the formation of liturgy as, for example, H.-Ch. Schmidt-Lauber has done in his book on *Eucharistie als Entfaltung der Verba Testamenti*, Kassel, 1957, is thoroughly legitimate.

¹⁴ I cannot agree with such a positivistic conception of the understanding of the nature of worship, as is presented in this posthumous work of L. Fendt: *Einführung in die Liturgiewissenschaft*, Berlin, 1958, in pointed contrast to the method of my own work. See my comments on the above book in STK 1958, p. 349 ff.

and explained in the preaching, then the formation of the liturgy can begin, but only where this order is followed could a genuine liturgy result.¹⁵ On the other hand, a theology which does not find its expression in the liturgy, and does not inevitably lead to prayer and the service of God, is an intellectual exercise rather than a real theology. Right here the exchange between theology and liturgy proves itself to be a rule of life for the church.¹⁶

From what has already been said, it is evident that the basis for the order of worship in the Lutheran Church must always be a theological one. Furthermore, it must also be made clear that this theological basis is the means by which one can differentiate between true and false proposals. It will perhaps serve our purpose best if we first compare some of the different conceptions of liturgy so that the limits within which the theological ground for liturgy can be sought in the Lutheran Church can become more clearly marked.

The Difference between Liturgies

The liturgy of the Lutheran worship service must be distinguished from two other positions: from a formless or free type of service, and from a legalistic liturgical order. Let us formulate these two positions more carefully.

1) *The so-called "formless" or "free" worship.* Time and again in the life of the church the opinion is expressed that the worship-life of a congregation must not be—as it is called—bound in the chains of a liturgical order. The freedom of the Holy Spirit is cited in support, and the form the worship of God will take within the congregation is left to the inspiration of the hour. One example of this form of worship by the congregation is the service of complete silence which naturally presupposes individual meditation. Even though this silence is often broken, this type of gathering for worship is in principle characterised by a thorough-going formlessness.¹⁷

This conception is grounded on the critique of those kinds of liturgical order which do not take into consideration the special circumstances involved in the actual services of worship, and which therefore seem to lose themselves in an abstract timelessness. The position is here espoused that a formal liturgy can only destroy the spiritual life. The congregation must, it is said, determine its own form of worship from place to place and from time to time; it is a continually new task. In principle, the worship is freely conducted according to the momen-

¹⁵ Naturally I am aware that there can be a liturgical development which later leads to a reformulation of doctrine. An interpretation of this kind of *lex orandi—lex credendi*, which stems from the formula of Prosper of Aquitaine, must be regarded as a danger for genuine liturgy and as an open door to human speculation. Concerning this formula see Karl Federer: *Liturgie und Glaube*, Freiburg (Switzerland), 1950; and Wilhelm Hahn: *Lex orandi—lex credendi als theologisches Prinzip im Lichte der Heiligen Schrift* (in the *Monatschrift für Pastoraltheologie*, 1956, p. 413 ff.).

¹⁶ R. Prenter: *Liturgie et Dogme* (*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*), Strasbourg, 1958.

¹⁷ The extreme here is practiced by the so-called "Quakers" (see the explanation of this group in *Ways of Worship*, London, 1957, p. 168 ff., where the other shades of this conception of "formlessness" can be studied in the reformed free church traditions).

One should not forget here that this conception of liturgy is occasionally advocated within the confines of Lutheranism. F. Flemming supports, for example, the thesis "that the ideal worship service is completely non-liturgical" and that "the characteristic mark of the ideal Lutheran (!) service is liturgical formlessness" (*Die treibenden Kräfte in der lutherischen Gottesdienstreform*, 1926, p. 47, 58).

tary inspiration of one individual, namely the leader of the service, either the preacher or the liturgist.

The Lutheran Church understands divine worship very differently from this conception for the following reasons:

a) Even there, where the claim to an inspired worship service is presupposed, the congregation in its regular celebration of worship soon finds itself in the situation where certain "free forms" have entrenched themselves.¹⁸ Furthermore, the protest against liturgy cannot long close its eyes to the fact that spiritual life cannot exist without some form, for according to the laws of human nature, it also eventually seeks to find some form or some shape.¹⁹ When this finally does occur, the danger then arises that the results of a fundamental formlessness become cherished as, in some qualified sense, better vehicles for the spiritual life than those forms which belong to the traditional liturgies of the church. Here we have that which the Reformation called "work-righteousness" and regarded as contrary to Christ and his righteousness.²⁰ The free worship understood as inspired by the Holy Spirit or as an accomplishment of the congregation which it offers unto God then becomes a merit which the congregation in question considers as its peculiar advantage, as over against those who, as one says, are not capable of such high spiritual activity. This is basically the same error which the Reformation rightly repudiated, because it substitutes something else for Christ and his ministry as Lord and Savior.

b) There is a second factor to be considered here. In the so-called "free" service of worship, the religious experience of one individual determines the cult of the congregation. Inevitably, such a "formlessness" can only mean: the congregation is dependent upon the momentary moods of its pastor or those members participating in the worship service, and since a spur-of-the-moment conducting of the worship is built upon their spiritual temperature, the worship service acquires another center than the Christ who is present through the activity of his spirit. The individual is expected to continually live on the mountain-tops of spiritual experience, thereby he consciously or unconsciously becomes the center of the worship service. When he is no longer able to creatively offer the congregation something new, the freezing of formlessness occurs, which places the congregation in a terrible "babylonian captivity." The form of the service cannot be endlessly varied. At some point even the most gifted spiritual person must fall victim to the law of repetition. What then occurs is the direct opposite of Christian freedom. The pressure of the congregation's expectation that an individual give continual evidence of great spiritual strength is bound to become damaging to him, but what is here said can easily be supported by

¹⁸ The opposition to the cult also develops its own ritual. Cf. S. Mowinkel: *Religion und Kultus*, Göttingen, 1953, pp. 8, 53.

¹⁹ The worship service under the conditions of the earthly existence of the congregation will always mean a contact with physical things. A worship service without shape or form would be an impossibility as a man without shape would be merely a mental abstraction. Cf. Fr. Heiler: *Der Katholizismus*, 1923, p. 165 f.

²⁰ L. Fendt has rightly described this as *die neue Sachwerdung in Der luth. Gottesdienst des 16. Jhdts.*, 1923, p. 101 ff.

many examples, for instance, the practice of "free prayer," etc. But this is not the place to go into this.²¹ We all know, however, that many a Christian, confused by this claim of a formless order of worship, has fled to the liturgical revival within the church and has here experienced something of a liberation.

2) *The legalistic order of liturgy.* The other position from which the concept of divine worship based on biblical Reformation theology must differentiate itself, is the conception that one particular liturgical order should have preference over all others. Be this order the result of the growth of centuries of experience or be it a new creation, it has a tendency to identify itself with the gospel. This conception must be rejected for the following reasons, among others:

a) Liturgy is always only a form, the earthly vessel. The eternal treasure of the gospel may be presented in this or that form, but the form always is merely the earthly appearance of God's gift. It is not the gift of God itself. Precisely because of this it can also be changed while the gift of God can never be changed. In that moment in which the liturgical order is invested with divine, that is, with eternal authority, it becomes a foreign power which the conscience must regard as a corrupting power. It becomes a law which has usurped the place of the gospel. At this point the Reformation critique of the Roman Church is still valid, for there, by command of the church, a liturgical order is laid upon the Christian as a thing of conscience. In the careful and precise performance of the correct form of liturgy the church guarantees salvation. The mass can be read for both the living and the dead, because the gift of salvation can be acquired by its mere prescribed performance, but only the papally authorised form of worship belongs, according to the Roman understanding, to the signs of the "one holy, catholic, and apostolic church."²² Therewith the liturgy has become a condition for salvation, but according to the biblical Reformation view, it must be dethroned from this position. The existence of a legalistically-understood order cannot be justified.

b) The history of the liturgical tradition also dare not be taken as law for the present, which is, however, being done all too frequently in our contemporary liturgical efforts. It is unimportant whether one takes as the standard either the Middle Ages or the Reformation, though certainly there were periods in history which were more creative than others. Nevertheless, what at one time was decisive in the history of liturgy is not an indisputable necessity for the present-day congregation. The liturgical creativity of the spirit in the contemporary congregation dare not be disregarded. It is therefore always dangerous to enforce forms upon a congregation which were produced in another era. A liturgical revival dare not take as its ultimate goal the mere *renaissance* of

²¹ Cf. R. Prenter: *Den evangeliske laere om bnnen* (in *Svensk Gudstnstilliv* 1950, pp. 1-9).

²² This thesis was vigorously held by Dom P. Guranger (NTU, Vol. II, p. 833). It is only in recent years that there have been attempts to indicate the possibility of varied forms, (e.g., through the use of the Byzantine Rite under Roman jurisdiction). See R. P. E. Mercenier—F. Paris: *La prire des Eglises de rite byzantine*, Vol. I, 2nd ed., Chevetogne, p. XI ff. But basically the character of the liturgy as an instrument of salvation through papal authorization is maintained.

discarded liturgical forms. The spiritual life can develop without having gone through any one particular historical development. The use of so-called classical forms of liturgy will not in itself guarantee a new liturgical life and a right service of worship for the congregation.

It might be helpful to illustrate the above by a few examples:

Anyone familiar with the history of liturgy knows that in its usage of the Lord's Prayer the Lutheran liturgy took over the western tradition, in which the petitions were recited by the liturgist.²³ In a number of churches during the war the custom developed in which the congregation prayed the Lord's Prayer together with the liturgist.²⁴ This is perhaps one example of a genuine liturgical act created by the need of a contemporary congregation. It represents a real renewal of the congregation as a praying congregation. Is it justified to question such a unique creative act of a congregation on the grounds that it does not coincide with the history of liturgy? Or: the history of liturgy teaches us that the *Gloria* had no regular stated place in the mass of the early Middle Ages; just like the *Halleluja*, it was only sung during the joyful seasons of the church year but not during Lent.²⁵ Our congregations have accustomed themselves to something else. They sing both the *Gloria* and the *Halleluja* during Lent. Does this mean that here we must make some changes? Why? Just because the history of liturgy evidences something different than that which is natural to us? Should that which was done with joy in our church for centuries be regarded as nothing more than a lamentable error? No one can seriously maintain that. Luther had already considered the *Halleluja* as "*vox perpetua ecclesiae, sicut perpetua est memoria passionis et victoriae eius*" (the eternal voice of the church, in which she continually remembers his (Christ's) passion and his victory).²⁶

The above examples should suffice to make clear that a formerly developed form of liturgy can never lay claim to sole validity in the church. A legalistic order forces the gospel from its throne and places the earthly vessel on the place of the eternal. The Lutheran Church maintains with equal right the necessity to ward itself against a legalistic liturgy as it does against a work-righteousness and it defines both as false teaching.

The Basis of the Liturgy

In the above we have followed through two different positions on liturgy from which that of the Lutheran Church must be distinguished. Both a liturgical formlessness and a liturgical legalism appear to the Lutheran churches as intolerable in the light of the gospel. The study of these two objectionable

²³ For this western use of the Lord's Prayer see Dom Gregory Dix: *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 2nd ed., 1945, p. 130 f. For the usage in the Lutheran Church, Luther D. Reed: *The Lutheran Liturgy*, Philadelphia, 1947, p. 87 ff. and 338 f.

²⁴ The history of liturgy is also acquainted with this congregational use of the Lord's Prayer, particularly in the eastern liturgies (J. S. Jungmann: *Missarum Sollemnia*, Freiburg, 1952, Vol. II, p. 356).

²⁵ *Leiturgia*, Vol. II, p. 23 ff., 72 f.

²⁶ WA 12, 210.

positions has already implied something concerning the theological basis of the liturgy which must now be explained in more detail. We shall contrast the liturgical formlessness to the order of love and liturgical legalism to freedom of faith, both of which are basic principles for liturgy in the framework of the Lutheran Church.²⁷

1) *The order of love.* Man does not live in this world as a solitary individual. By the very nature of the creation of humanity, he is bound together with other men. He has fellow-men, and he has a neighbor whom God has given him and has commanded him to love. Certainly he can attempt to deny his solidarity with humanity by withdrawing from society, but therewith he comes into conflict with God's command because he seeks to evade the services which God wants to perform through him to his fellows and neighbors. By such conduct, he does not share what God has given him, but seeks instead to selfishly hoard God's fatherly gift, and in doing so he loses it. Without serving his neighbor he is no longer a man.

What is here indicated holds true in a very special way for the problem of liturgy, which is our chief concern. The church is a *communio sanctorum*. By *communio* is not meant here that a few individuals come together in order to share their religious needs and experiences in the presence of other individuals.²⁸ Instead the church is the body of Christ, where each member finds his true place in the structure of the whole. The Christian is also a person bound to the fellowship of the Christian congregation, that is, he lives here, with his neighbors. His individual life is merged with that of others in the communion of saints.²⁹ Precisely this relationship to his neighbor within the congregation has wide consequences for the liturgical formation of the church's worship.

Love of one's neighbor necessitates an external order. The so-called "pneumatic" achievements of the individual dare not assume control and become a phenomenon in the total liturgy which is not understandable to the congregation, the assembly of neighbors gathered for worship. Love of one's neighbor demands an ordered liturgy wherein the assembly of persons gathered for worship, rather than the individual, becomes the forming principle (I Cor. 14:12). Certainly the man of faith is free from a particular staid and determined liturgy, for he exercises his worship under the influence of the Holy Spirit but yet must subject himself to some external order. In the first place, he is no perfect Christian, nor would he dare to offer his spiritual life as the pattern and rule for the entire congregation. Instead he must, to the end of his life, seek to perfect his faith in God's word as that word comes to him through his neighbor.³⁰ Secondly, he must submit himself to an external order for the sake of his neighbor, who might thereby

²⁷ In what follows, cf. Vajta *ibid.*, p. 316 ff.

²⁸ Cf. to New Testament and ancient church usage, W. Elert: *Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft*, Berlin 1954, p. 17 ff.

²⁹ Cf. E. Kinder: *Der evangelische Glaube und die Kirche*, Berlin, 1959, p. 20 ff., 78 ff.

³⁰ Only in this eschatological perspective can one justly speak of a "pedagogic" conception of worship. The usual pedagogic view (cf. Vajta, *ibid.*, p. 33 ff. and Fr. Kalb: *Die Lehre vom Kultus der lutherischen Kirche zur Zeit der Orthodoxie*, Berlin, 1959, esp. p. 61 ff.) has missed just this eschatological perspective.

be helped to the same faith which has been granted to him. The worship of God in the freedom of faith does not imply the rejection of all external order. Because the Christian is bound to his neighbor in love, even in the liturgical order, his "old Adam," which tries to assert itself above all others, must continually be conquered. Through the established order of the congregation the individual loses himself in the communion of saints. Thereby he becomes a member of the body of Christ in which each has his own function. Thus he is initiated into the new temple of the new priesthood of Christ.

Human life in its present earthly form is inconceivable without distinct external relationships. Men are not idle, instead they have their hands full of work. In this physical life a man must eat, drink, and clothe himself, build houses, work, etc. He can in no way avoid work. The same is true of worship. Because man is man, his worship of God takes place on certain days and at certain times. There is, for example, a particular behavior connected with the administration of the sacraments by the pastor and with their reception by the congregation in prayer and thanksgiving. Men must make use of liturgical forms when worshipping God. To deny these facts would be to deny physical life. Because of this, liturgical forms must be so conceived as to serve the entire congregation. They must grow out of love to one's neighbor and must be continually tested by this rule.

The liturgical movement in our church should never lose sight of the order of love as the basis for liturgy. Concretely stated: liturgy should never be the province of the experts only, whereby a few advanced specialists impose things upon the congregation for which it is either not mature enough or which it absolutely fails to understand out of its own Christian faith. We know the liturgical zealots in our church. They have discovered the liturgical treasure of the church as a God-given blessing upon their own lives and now wish to impose exactly these forms upon the congregation through which they receive them. They often have no understanding for the fact that the congregation resists their liturgical zeal, not merely because of immaturity and backwardness but out of genuine Christian faith and for the sake of the communion of saints. In our present-day liturgical endeavors we must begin to take the congregation seriously and not just that part of the congregation which will go along with the latest liturgical innovations, but also the total body which joyfully receives God's word in sermon and sacrament and which is ready to address God with songs of praise and confession of faith, although often in a very different way than that considered "classically liturgical" by the specialist. Would it not also be a commandment of love to seriously take a congregation into consideration in our liturgical endeavors? This would certainly be a genuine biblical-theological basis for the liturgy in the Lutheran Church.

2) *The freedom of faith.* In contrast to the legalistic approach to liturgy we shall now consider the freedom of faith as a theological basis for the liturgy in the Lutheran Church.

The Christian is a free man. Faith in Christ means freedom from all human works and legalistic systems, including freedom from ceremonies and liturgical forms. The man of faith is not made righteous by doing this or that, or by addressing God in this or that manner, but solely because he received everything from God as a free gift in Christ. Furthermore, his freedom is characterised by the fact that God himself comes to man, and man is not required to build his own way to heaven. Christian freedom is dependent upon this very unusual righteousness, that is, the righteousness which God gives to man for the sake of his Son and not because man has either earned or deserved it. Pious works, even though they be perfect, classical, beautiful liturgical orders, can never pave the way to heaven. Christ is our only righteousness, therefore no justifying or saving power can be ascribed to any liturgical form or church ceremony as is done in the legalistic conception of liturgy, for these are not conditions for salvation.

Christian freedom, on the other hand, must never be misunderstood as a freedom from God and his works. On these works man is bound, in the sense that his freedom only becomes a reality in Christ and in the sharing of Christ's task. Man is not freed from the gospel. Instead he is bound to it. Precisely this being bound to the gospel is his freedom.³¹

The man of faith is, in his inner nature, consequently, free from every form of worship which is bound to particular times, places, forms and human standards. His true worship is the gospel and his faith.

See, this is the proper worship of God, for which one needs neither bells, nor churches, neither vessels, nor ornaments, neither lights nor candles, neither organ, nor song, neither paintings nor images, neither table nor altar, no vestments or mitre, no incense or sprinkling, no procession or cloisters, no indulgences or letters. These are all inventions and devices of men, which God does not respect, and their glitter blinds the eye to the true worship of God. Only one thing is necessary, that one live according to the gospel, and teach the people so to worship God; this is the right bell and organ for true worship (Luther's Church Postile, Weimar Edition, 10 I 1, 39:10).

With this is said that everything connected with ceremonies of worship is an external matter and not a matter of conscience. For the Christian faith is not determined by external things but the heart which trusts the work of Christ. Therefore the service of God is not bound to the many outward customs in which it is clothed.

It is further necessary to recall a distinction which should be self-understood. To reject the dependence of worship upon any external ceremonies does not belie the fact that in worship an act of God takes place which is the object of faith, for the worship is dependent upon those external things through which God chooses to reveal himself. Man is neither free from the external "spoken word" nor from the external things "the sacraments." God's invasion of the

³¹ See below.

physical, that is, his entering into the conditions of human life, taking its very limitations upon himself, in no way lends support to an "inner-spiritualised" service of worship. It invalidates such a false interpretation of freedom. The dependence of man upon these physical works of God is a necessary condition of faith and emphasizes that our freedom must always be dependent on Christ.³² Because of the fact that our freedom as Christians is dependent on Christ, our Christian worship, although free from all legalism, is, however, bound to those particular "ceremonies" which God has instituted, namely, the preaching of the word and the sacraments.³³ At the same time, however, his dependence upon God frees the individual from that which men command and devise. The difference between those external things which Christ has commanded and those which men initiate must be clearly emphasized, so that the conscience is not over-loaded with non-essentials. Human teachings which seek to interfere in the affairs of God of necessity fall into error. Human institutions are not essential to salvation. Righteousness cannot be won through them, for Christ is given as the free gift of God, and the observance of the law can accomplish nothing as far as salvation is concerned.

This Christian freedom must be proclaimed; therefore all liturgy is bound by the preaching of the gospel.³⁴ Where Christ is clearly and unequivocally preached as our only righteousness, the attempt of human works to force themselves upon the conscience and the temptations which result therefrom will again and again be averted. Only a liturgy which is characterised by this conception of Christian freedom has the right to exist in the Lutheran Church. Therefore those responsible people who advocate a liturgical movement should, more than any others, campaign intensively for the clear preaching of the gospel. Where the freedom-granting word of God is not declared, the claims of self-righteousness through correct liturgical observance raise their ugly head, and a congregation is reared which is of the opinion that only where a particular liturgy is performed can the worship of God be rightly celebrated. It is hardly noticed that when this occurs true worship has actually ceased to exist. Where Christ is not preached, human pride, which asserts itself through the liturgy, gradually usurps the center which belongs to Christ.

There is one very definite view-point current today which partially owes its existence to the liturgical movement, namely, that our congregations are "preached to death" and can only be saved through the liturgy. Therefore: less preaching and more liturgy. Devotions and the celebration of the sacrament without preaching are offered as cures for our problems. Here it must be carefully

³² P. Brunner has drawn this from the dependence of the form on the words, and has described it as "that which is commanded" in *Liturgia*, Vol. I, p. 272 ff.

³³ Cf. Th. Knolle: *Bindung und Freiheit in der liturgischen Gestaltung*, 1932, pp. 8 ff., 11 ff., where the concept of love as a limitation of freedom is underscored. Also by the same author *Luthers Reform der Abendmahlsfeier*, 1950, p. 91.

³⁴ See Conrad Bergendoff: *The Sermon in the Lutheran Liturgy* (in *The Unity of the Church: A Symposium*, Rock Island, Ill., 1957, p. 125 ff.) and Bo Giertz: *The Meaning and Task of the Sermon in the Framework of the Liturgy* (in the same place, p. 133 ff.)

noted that a "liturgical heresy" is trying to take hold in our churches. It might be that many of our local congregations are dead, but certainly not as the result of preaching. Perhaps much more because too much was merely talk rather than proclamation. Up to now, only living congregations have resulted where Christ has been proclaimed, and this is still true. Our whole concern with the liturgy and with the renewal of church music would lead in a false direction; in fact, it would completely jump the track were it to become a substitute for the living proclamation of Christ. Only a congregation set free by the good news of the gospel can receive blessing from its liturgy. Otherwise it becomes a thing of corruption. For when man takes upon his lips the most orthodox liturgy available without possessing freedom of faith it becomes a power which can turn him away from God. Therefore those who are working for a liturgical revival in our church should strive more decidedly than any others for the clear proclamation of the gospel. Where the freedom-granting word of God concerning Christ as the Lord and Savior is clearly proclaimed in a congregation, there occurs a genuine liturgical revival despite the poorest of all liturgical forms of expression, because here the liturgy is fulfilled with genuine prayer, praise, and confession of faith. Liturgy is the proclamation of the glorious deeds of God. Where liturgy is understood as something other than proclamation it has lost its heart. Where Christ is proclaimed, however, the liturgy becomes a fresh source of spiritual renewal and eternal life.

III

We have shown that *the liturgy in its differentiation from formlessness, on the one hand, and legalism, on the other, is based on the order of love and the freedom of faith.* It is necessary to underscore one thing, namely, that the order of love and the freedom of faith *cannot be separated from one another.* They belong together and supplement one another, indeed, their mutual interaction provides the basis for liturgy. Precisely in connection with these two thoughts our initial thesis, which maintained the togetherness of liturgy and theology, finds its validation. In these two basic principles, the order of love and the freedom of faith, we again find the christological center of all genuine Christian liturgy. For Christ himself had given up his divine freedom in obedient faith, and subjected himself to the conditions of this human life out of his love for lost mankind, in order to minister to us and to give us his divine freedom. He freely came to man as his neighbor, entered into his need, in order to save him, and to grant him that divine freedom which liberates him from all foreign powers by bringing him into full fellowship with God. So in liturgy the Christian is set free from legalism, but enters into its order out of love for his neighbor, and there the two together share the blessings of Christ and are on their way to that heavenly land where there will be no more temple, but where eternal praises will be sung to God

and the Lamb. The Christian who presents his service to God in the liturgy lives completely from God's service to us in Christ. Liturgy is serving Christ, which is its only theological basis in the Lutheran Church. If liturgy were no longer that, then its faith would be that of the salt which has lost its savor, which "is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men" (Matt. 5:13).

The Ministry and the Ministry of Women

PETER BRUNNER

THE QUESTION involved in our topic is one of those basic questions being raised with particular urgency within Christendom in this century. In the ancient church the question concerning the nature of the official service of women in the church was a very lively one, resulting from the necessary controversy with gnostic and heretical groups. The very complicated, and in its unfolding almost tragic, history of the orders for widows and deaconesses in the ancient church shows that a real question was involved here which had to be answered by an orderly ruling of the church. It must be deeply regretted that the revival of the deaconess order in the 19th century concerned itself very insufficiently with the ancient church's concern for the ministry of women, and that it in no way led to a well-founded theological restatement of the office of the ministry of women in the church. Therefore, we have no established living tradition which effectively dealt with the ministry of women which we can cite as a guide in our present attempts to solve the problem raised by our topic. This renders a solution extraordinarily difficult.

In connection with their changing social status, an increasing number of women have undertaken the study of theology since World War I. Between the first and second World Wars, their employment in the service of many of the *Landeskirchen* in Germany was regulated by church law. Although the various regulations differed greatly from one another, they were all in agreement on one point—the office of the pastor was not open to women. During the World War II, however, emergency situations made it necessary for women to conduct worship services and to lead congregations, thus raising anew the question of “women and the pastoral office” with particular emphasis on its doctrinal and canonical aspects.

The problem acquired almost dramatic proportions during the events of the last few years in Sweden, of which Sten Röhde reported in this journal in March 1958 and 1959. To what degree the Danish *volkskirke*, in which ordained women are already serving, is disturbed by this problem is evidenced by the controversy between three Danish pastors, Regin Prenter and Bishop Høgsbro which appeared in print just this past summer.¹ In the United Evangelical-Lutheran Church of Germany the question has also flared up again since one of its member churches, the Church of Lübeck, in a ruling of September 1, 1958, provided a position in the *Landeskirche* for a ministry to women outside of the individual congregations, which position should be filled by a woman theo-

¹ *Kvinden og Kirckens Embede*, Nyt Nordisk Forlag - Arnold Busck, Copenhagen, 1958.

logian.² The problematic behind this pastorate roots in the fact that she, alongside of her other duties, has also been assigned to a local congregation in which she must conduct services of worship. It is well known that in churches of the Reformed tradition and in the Free Churches, women have been serving as pastors of parishes for some time now, and lately within the Anglican Church the question whether women can be ordained to the priesthood has been raised and supported with serious theological arguments.³ Only within the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox churches is the position unquestionably maintained that women cannot be ordained to the priesthood.

If we look to the confessional standards of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, we find that they do not express themselves on the problem of the ordination of women to the pastoral ministry. They do not cite the ordinance in I Cor. 14:34 ff. and I Tim. 2:11, which prohibits women from teaching in the church. Without doubt, the confessions are referring to men when they talk about pastors and bishops. The functions of these ministers are based upon the commission with which Christ called his disciples, and include the following: the preaching of the gospel, the administration of the sacraments, the conferring of absolution, the rejection of false doctrine, and the excommunication of the ungodly. In this sense the office of the pastor or the bishop derives from that of the apostles, as the confessions explicitly state. On the other hand, the spiritual office under the new covenant is no longer a Levitical priesthood; it is also not bound to particular sacred places or holy persons, instead "it is scattered throughout the world"; it is there where God has granted his spiritual gifts (according to Eph. 4:7) namely, apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers. Furthermore, one must remember that the church must have additional orders which do not directly derive from the above-mentioned functions of the pastoral office instituted by divine commission. These orders serve that "everything be done in good order." According to the Augsburg Confession, the regulation by St. Paul in I Cor. 11:5, that women should cover their heads with a headpiece or a veil when the congregation assembles for worship and the instruction in I Cor. 14:30 that the preachers in the worship service should not all talk at the same time, but in an orderly fashion one after the other, are examples of such orders.⁴ Such orders are to be observed for the sake of "the love of peace," so that no one offends his brother and that everything in the church may be done in good order.⁵

When one turns to the confessional standards for an answer to the question whether or not women should be ordained to the pastoral ministry, an answer is only possible by drawing theological conclusions from them. These conclusions can be drawn, however, in various directions. If one starts from the proposition that it pleased God in Jesus Christ to trust men exclusively with the public exercise

² *Amtsblatt der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche*, Vol. 1, No. 13, July 15, 1959.

³ M. E. Thrall: *The Ordination of Women to the Priesthood*, London, 1958.

⁴ Notice that there is no reference to I Cor. 14:34 f. in this connection!

⁵ Cf. *CA and Apol.* XXVIII and *Tractatus de potestate Papae*.

of the pastoral functions because he called only the apostles, then one can also say: the church today must take these circumstances, which do not allow for further deduction, into account, and must refuse to appoint women either as pastors or as bishops.⁶ On the other hand, if one starts from the proposition that the pastoral office under the new covenant is no longer considered in the "levitic" sense, but is dependent solely upon the gift of the exalted Lord and in the last analysis finds its legitimization in the content of its gospel, then one can come to the conclusion that, "from the nature of the office itself as it is described here (in the confessional books), there is no ground for the exclusion of women."⁷ Starting from the concept of order and peace, one can arrive at directly opposite conclusions. There is no question but that the investiture of women with the pastoral office and the office of bishop has created a new set of circumstances serving to separate the Lutheran churches on the one side from the Roman Catholic and Orthodox churches on the other. The practice of the Lutheran Reformation of the 16th century had at this point initiated no change from that of these two church groups, as has been done by the actions in the Scandinavian countries and in Lübeck. Is this obvious widening of the gulf really necessary? Will it serve the cause of peace? On the other hand, one can ask whether the ordination of women is not necessitated by genuine needs within the Lutheran churches themselves and therefore is serving the cause of peace and the upbuilding of congregations, while the retention of the Reformation practice is a symptom of the kind of conservatism which must be avoided as much as possible because of the offence it gives to many in our contemporary situation. But experience has shown that just the opposite situation also exists, namely, that the ordination of women has given offense, perhaps dogmatically ill-founded offense. But the offense which the Roman Christians at the time of St. Paul took to the eating of meat was also ill-founded; in fact, their objections represented much more a rejection of the ideal of freedom found in the gospel, and yet Paul took them into account in his instructions to the church at Rome. This train of thought also leads to no clear and obvious conclusions.

Let us turn in our question to Luther himself. He expressed himself on this subject upon many occasions and in many contexts, and yet his conviction about it remained basically unchanged.⁸ Already the first rather lengthy exposition on *De abroganda missa privata* (1521) contains his basic position.⁹ To all Christians is given the full power to preach the gospel, but not all Christians exercise this right in its fullness. Many can (*posse*) make no use of this full power, because they lack the necessary natural abilities, as, for example, the dumb lack the ability to speak, etc. Others do not dare exercise it (*non*

⁶ Along this line Regin Prenter has made some important observations in *Kvinden og Kirkens Embede*. Cf. there p. 56 ff. and p. 126.

⁷ Fritz Zerbst: *Das Amt der Frau in der Kirche*, Vienna, n.d. (1951?), p. 78.

⁸ Cf. Heinz Brunotte: *Die Befugnisse der Vikarin*, in ELKZ 10 (1956), p. 411 ff.

⁹ WA 8, 424,20-425,6; in the same place, in the German edition, p. 497,19-498,14.

tamen... debere exequi). Therefore women are not allowed to preach in the assemblies of the congregation even though the spiritual power has been bestowed upon them. The determining factor for Luther is the aptitude of the individual, and here the difference between man and woman is important. The man is in many ways (*multis modis*) more adapted to speaking than is the woman, and it seems more fitting and proper for him to speak. The instructions which the Holy Ghost gives in the Scriptures and the works which he performs in the church correspond to this point of view, although, to be sure, the Holy Ghost had promised through the prophet Joel that women will also be able to prophesy, and furthermore we actually do have the account of the four virgin daughters of Philipppus who prophesied in the Acts of the Apostles. Miriam, Moses' sister, was a prophetess (Ex. 15:20); the prophetess Huldah preached the word of God to the pious king Josiah (II Kings 22:14 ff.), and Deborah counseled the male chieftain Barak (Judg. 4:6). Yes, to this very day the Virgin Mary speaks to the church in the entire world through her *Magnificat*. Despite all of this, the command of St. Paul in I Cor. 14:34 that women keep silent, not under all circumstances, but in the congregational assemblies, is in keeping with the work of the Holy Ghost. In the law, the Holy Ghost had subordinated the woman to the man. If the Holy Ghost were to allow women to preach in the congregational services, he would be contradicting his own work in the law by raising the woman above the man, but this is absolutely impossible because the Spirit does not contradict itself (*spiritus sibi ipsi non contradicit*). This position which the Holy Spirit has assigned to the woman in her relationships with man according to the Scriptures is the reason why women are not fit to be called to the public exercise of the pastoral office. If women were to speak in the congregation where men are present, as in the church in Corinth, then both *ordo* and *honestas* would be upset, and both of these in Luther's view are definitely subject to the working of the Spirit. It is his conviction that as long as there are men in the congregation, the Spirit will much sooner come upon them and inspire them to preach than it will to women. Certainly, if the situation would arise in which there are no available men, then it would be necessary for women to preach.

In later years Luther re-emphasized the obligatory nature of the Pauline command to silence in his controversy with the enthusiasts (*Schwärmer*). His comments in the writing *Von Schleichern und Winkelpredigern* (1532)¹⁰ are very interesting. Here he offers to the "anabaptists" an argument which they could have used to their own advantage as support for their conception of the charismatic calling and rights of laymen, namely, the Scriptural proof that in both the Old and New Testaments women at times proclaimed the word of God to men. To those figures whom he had already mentioned in 1521 he now adds the "wise woman" of the city of Abel (II Sam. 20:16 ff.) and Sarah who ordered

¹⁰ WA 30 III, 542,10 ff.

her "Lord and Master" to drive out Ishmael and his mother, a command which bore important consequences for the history of the salvation of God's people, and which was confirmed by God in that Abraham was commanded to obey it. He also includes the prophetess Hannah in Luke 2 in the circle of women possessing charismatic gifts. With these references, the anabaptists could have "decorated" themselves and on their authority given women the right to preach in the church. Luther is not interested in investigating further "what right these women in the Old Testament had to teach and to rule," but he does emphasize that they did not do so without being called, that is, as a result of their own reflections, nor on the basis of their own pietistic impulses.¹¹ The evidence for the legitimacy of the teaching and governing of these women he finds in the fact that God substantiated their ministry and work with miracles and great deeds. In this connection Luther speaks about the Pauline command to keep silent which was clearly inspired by the Holy Spirit.¹² Through St. Paul the Holy Ghost himself determines the role which women are to play in the worship services—they are to keep silent, that is, they are not to preach. This command, declares Paul, is the command of the Lord.¹³ As for the rest, women can and should "pray, sing, praise and say Amen, and read and teach one another in the household, admonishing, comforting and also expounding the Holy Scriptures" as well as they possibly can.

Thus Luther had a very unequivocal answer to the question whether or not women should be called to the pastoral office, which can be summarized under the following points:

1. All Christians have the spiritual power to proclaim the word of God and that includes women.
2. In the assembled congregation, only he may preach the word who has been called to do so by the church.
3. Only he may be called, who has the ability.
4. In determining whether one possesses the ability, spiritual and natural factors must be considered.
5. The subordination of the woman to the man, as has been established in the Old Testament, has not been revoked in the New Testament; rather it has been substantiated by the Holy Spirit through the pronouncements of the apostles.¹⁴

¹¹ According to Luther the prophetic call is something else than a *vocatio interna*; it is not a "feeling of having been called."

¹² Also in the writing *Von Konzilien und Kirche* 1539, WA 50, 633, 12 ff. The Holy Spirit has excluded women, children and incapable people from the office of preaching.

¹³ It is inconceivable how the editor could surmise in the Weimar Edition 8, 524, Anm. 3, that Luther is here referring to I Cor. 7:10 where Paul supports his instructions with a clear directive of the Lord concerning women. There is no question that Luther had I Cor. 14:37 in mind, which he translated in all editions of his German Bible in the following manner: "So sich jemand lässet dünken, er sei ein Prophet oder Geistlich, der erkenne, was ich euch schreibe, Denn es sind des Herrn Gebot." (If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let Him acknowledge that what I write are the commandments of the Lord.) See the WADB 7, 128 and 129. Luther read the text of the Koine version, which the Vulgata also renders: . . . *quia Domini sunt mandata*. In WA 30 III, 524, 29, Luther relates this turn of expression to the preceding command to silence and in this manner arrives at the singular which is in fact offered in the Egyptian version and is taken up by Nestle. See footnote 27.

¹⁴ See also WA 50, 633, 20 ff., where Luther says that "even nature and God's creation" prove that women can and should have no authority. Experience and God's word—Gen. 3:16—go hand in hand here. "The gospel does not contradict natural law, but confirms it as God's order and creation."

6. The Holy Ghost would contradict himself if he allowed women to preach in the services of the congregation as long as there were men present whom he has inspired thereto.
7. The *ordo*, which must be here maintained, has a spiritual character; it is the work of the Holy Ghost. The moral attitude which corresponds to this *ordo* is propriety. Neither the *ordo* nor its corresponding sense of propriety dare be violated.
8. As long as the presupposition holds true that there are men present whom the Holy Ghost has inspired to preach, it is not proper for the woman to be called to exercise publicly the pastoral office.
9. One can safely assume that the Holy Spirit, in keeping with his directives in the Holy Scriptures, will see to it that capable men are not lacking. Should this unusual circumstance prevail, nevertheless,¹⁵ then—but only then—must women also preach in the services of the congregation.¹⁶

The loftiness of Luther's point of view was not shared by the fathers of Lutheran orthodoxy. The question, why men and not women should preach in the church, was discussed by them as part of the adiaphora-problem, upon which the interim had placed such emphasis. In 1549 the Ministerium of Hamburg requested the Faculty of the University of Wittenberg to clarify certain questions concerning secondary matters (*Mitteldinge*), whereby it was clear just what the clergymen of Hamburg considered as adiaphora, such as the custom that men can pray with uncovered heads, while women must cover theirs; that men and not women are allowed to preach, and that the organ can be used in worship, among others.¹⁷ Flacius, in his treatise *De veris et falsis adiaphoris* publicly supports the opinions of the Hamburg clergy. The fact that men are allowed to speak in church and women are not, is a ruling which cannot be supported by a divine command (*jus divinum*). As an order of human law (*juris humanum*) it is subject to the judgment of the church, though certainly not to arbitrary choice. Even the adiaphora of the Hamburg clergy were subject to an ethical norm, namely, the principle of what is best for the building up of the congregation. Therefore the particular forms of church order which exist dare not contradict "what is generally considered to be proper and decent."¹⁸ Respectability and propriety are the standards which give men precedence over women in calling them to fill the offices of the church. Flacius sees this decision

¹⁵ Besides WA 8, 424, 37, see also WA 10, III, 171, 10: "Were it to come to this (which I do not intend) that no man were present, but only vain women, then a woman must step up and preach to the others, otherwise not."

¹⁶ Heinz Brunotte (see footnote 8) does not do justice to the importance of this basic principle of Luther's in his interpretation of the text in question. The fact that Luther considered the Pauline command to silence a work of the Holy Spirit, and, to be sure, a work of the Spirit who does not contradict himself, is not considered by Brunotte. Therefore he does not sufficiently bring out the spiritual character of the "order" as one which God has established. He over-emphasizes Luther's dependence upon the times and underestimates his dependence on the biblical text. He overlooks the fact that one can neither dogmatically nor according to canon law achieve the situation here presented through the schema "*de jure divino—de jure humano*."

¹⁷ See Paul Fleisch: *Ein Wort aus der Reformationszeit zu den Befugnissen der Vikarin*, in ELKZ 9 (1955), p. 396 ff. I have also taken the statements concerning Flacius from this article. One must take note how, in contrast to CA XXVIII, 54, the apostle's command to silence is without hesitation placed on the same level as the command concerning head-coverings, and is seen as a simple question of church order.

¹⁸ Formulation according to Paul Fleisch, *ibid*.

of the church on much the same level as the fact that mornings were chosen over evenings as the proper time of day for worship services, and that the services were begun with a worthy and modest hymn. The standard which determines respectability is obviously the general cultural attitude rather than the relationship between man and woman as it is ordered by the Holy Spirit.

The arguments which Johann Gerhard presents in his *Locus XXIII* under No. 186 also fail to match the insights of Luther.¹⁹ He understands the instructions of St. Paul which explicitly (*disertis verbis*) deny women the right to hold the preaching office in the church as a necessary reaction to the matriarchal tendencies of various heretical sects of the time which are described in the writings of the church fathers. To be sure, there were a few women in the Old Testament who, in a very extraordinary manner, were equipped with prophetic gifts. Furthermore, Christ himself told the women to bring the disciples the news of his resurrection, and one of the apostles even calls a woman, namely Priscilla, "his fellow-worker in the Lord." But no one dare conclude from this that women are to occupy the regular preaching office in the church except in cases of emergency (*extra necessitatis casum*). What constitutes such an emergency is, however, not explained. When Paul calls Phoebe a "minister" of the church at Cenchreae he is not referring here to the public office of preaching, but to the charitable ministries such as the care of the sick, the poor, and the strangers. At any rate, pious women can instruct their families and their households in the faith; in fact, it is their duty to do so. The reasons which Gerhard gives for the apostolic command to silence are very heavily influenced by the anything but flattering judgments of the church fathers.²⁰ Of theological value is only the thought which Gerhard derives from Paul himself, namely, that the woman is subordinated to the man. The moral attitude which derives from this principle is characterized by Gerhard in the concepts of "reserve" (*verecundia*) and "humility" (*humilitas*) which he uses to elucidate the biblical concept of "hypotage." The practice of women preaching in church runs counter to the order of nature and to the law (Gen. 3:16), which demand reserve and humility of the woman; therefore it was forbidden by Paul.

This short survey shows us that any attempt to clarify the relationship of women to the office of the ministry on theological grounds places a new task before us. The declarations of the confessional standards do not give us a ready answer; rather we must, through our own theological reflection, arrive at a solution along the lines which they have staked out. The assertion that the Holy Ghost has solved our problem for all time through the admonitions of the apostle can be neither the beginning nor the end of our deliberations. According to evangelical

¹⁹ See the edition of the *Loci* by Ed. Preuss, Part VI, Berlin, 1868, pp. 125 ff.

²⁰ With Chrysostom he would like to restrict the *loquacitas, quae in hoc sexu fere nimia est*. With Epiphanius he does not trust the discriminatory faculties of women, in fact, he does not think much of their intellectual abilities at all and certainly not of their ability to carry on a logical discussion. With Anselm he agrees that it is quite in order for Paul to forbid women the right to speak because where she did speak (in Paradise) she persuaded her husband to sin.

doctrine, there is no final form of church order which can be biblically or legally maintained for all time. This is made unequivocally clear by the fact that in this connection contemporary Christendom has passed over St. Paul's admonition to the Corinthian women that they must keep their heads covered in church. The matter with which Paul concerns himself in I Cor. 11:2-11 is undoubtedly of great importance. With an extraordinary display of theological acumen, Paul is trying to make clear to the women in Corinth: you are and remain women in the worship services and you dare not conduct yourselves as if you could take the place which God has accorded to men. The church in all ages must seek to preserve and to interpret this insight, but the situation in which it must be observed and interpreted today differs greatly from that of Paul and the Corinthian women. No one today would think of correcting a Christian woman because she participates in the worship services or partakes of the Lord's Supper with her head uncovered. Could it possibly be that Paul's command to silence in I Cor. 14:34 is essentially the same as his admonitions concerning the covering of one's head in I Cor. 11:10, and therefore just as open to reinterpretation?

This attempt to solve the problem of the ordination of women to the ministry through our theological deliberations will involve great difficulties, because the question with which we are concerned involves many other problems about which there is no general consensus of opinion in the Lutheran churches today. Take for instance the question, what is the doctrine of the ministry which the church must teach today? Despite the intensive and heated controversy within the Lutheran churches of the 19th century, theological opinion differs greatly on this point.²¹ Furthermore, there is the "hermeneutic" problem, which today includes the question of the authority of the Scriptures. What is the significance of the creation narratives in Gen. 1-3 for the proclamation of the gospel? Can we make dogmatic use of this creation account in the manner in which Paul did in I Cor. 11:3-12 and obviously also in I Cor. 14:34? Can we relate the account of the fall to the prohibition against women teaching in the church as is done in I Tim. 2:14? Is there not in this passage a judaistic conception of the woman which we must reject in the light of the gospel?

Above all else, we must take into account the theological doctrine of the sexual difference between man and woman. It is extremely necessary for the church to interpret this natural state doctrinally, if she wants to present the message of the New Testament in a relevant fashion. She cannot be satisfied to borrow the insights of biology, psychology, philosophy, sociology, or medicine. Texts such as Eph. 5:22-33, Col. 3:18 ff. and I Pet. 3:1-7 show that the church must say something about what it means to be man or woman before God; it must say something which can be said by no one else in the world, because what it says is said in the light of its understanding of the gospel. How is this to be said?

²¹ For my own treatment of the ministry see my essay *Vom Amt des Bischofs*, in *Schriften des theologischen Konventes Augsburger Bekenntnisses*, Book 9, Berlin, 1955, pp. 5-77, and *Das Heil und das Amt* in *Lutherische Nachrichten*, Vol. 7, (1959), No. 40/41, pp. 4-26.

What must be its content? It is my opinion that the question whether or not women should be ordained to the ministry depends upon the theological doctrine of the nature and relationship between the God-given sexes.

Finally there is the question, to say nothing of many others, of the relationship between doctrine and church order. Certainly, one very important standard of measurement is already given in the distinction between that which must occur in the church *de jure divino* and that which is only *juris humani*. Certainly, the principle that in the building-up of the congregation orderliness and propriety are essential is valid in those things for which no direct divine imperative is evident. But are these standards and perspectives sufficient? The *Kirchenkampf* in Germany has shown us that the questions concerning church order are much more inter-related with the message of the church than was generally conceded to be the case in Protestantism. The Barmen Declaration of 1934 declared that the Christian church "with her faith as well as with her obedience, with her message as well as with her order" must witness that she belongs to Christ.²² To be sure, this formulation, and in particular the little word "as," needs some explanation to clarify specifically the relationship between faith and obedience, message and order, and protect it from misunderstanding. But the principle that the order of the church cannot stand in contradiction to her gospel is one of the fundamental insights of the Lutheran Reformation. The Barmen Declaration was right when it labeled the opinion "that the church could leave the form of her message and her order up to her pleasure or to the changes in the then prevailing philosophical and political perspectives" as a heresy. It is obvious that this statement is of considerable importance to our discussion. Could it not be possible that the laws which provide for the ordination of women to the ministry in Denmark and Sweden rest on a general philosophy of life which has its roots in the Enlightenment and in the Idealism of the 19th century? Through which order does the church truly give witness that she is bound to Christ and to his gospel, through the ordination of women to the ministry or through the prohibition thereof?²³

Because of the many complex theological problems involved in our theme and in the light of their great difficulty, it cannot be expected that the following considerations will present an exhaustive treatment of the problem or that they will lead to a unanimously acceptable solution. It also cannot be expected that a general consensus of opinion concerning the problem under discussion will suddenly make its appearance in the Lutheran churches of the world. It cannot be denied, however, that it is a vital question for the Lutheran fellowship whether

²² See the text by Kurt Dietrich Schmidt *Die Bekenntnisse und grundsätzliche Äusserungen zur Kirchenfrage*, Vol. 2, *Das Jahr 1934*, Göttingen, 1935, p. 94.

²³ Fr. Zerbst well recognized the close connection between the content of the proclamation and the order of the church as they are involved in our question when he wrote, for example, p. 80, *ibid.*: "The church cannot allow its ministers to contradict the content of their message by their personal lives. Therefore she demands from each member of the body of Christ conduct in keeping with his word. In regard to the calling of women to the ministry, it must be carefully considered whether entrusting the woman with the proclamation of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments does not cancel out the proclamation of the church concerning her position according to the creation. First of all, it is decisive for our problem to discover what the church as such teaches about the position of the woman and then whether this doctrine must not also find expression in the ordering of the church's ministries."

or not such a consensus will be granted her. Even though the question of the ordination of women to the ministry has been decided by church law in individual churches, yet the theological importance of this decision has not been settled. It is still open to discussion whether an order which makes this allowance may not stand in direct contradiction to the content of the apostolic proclamation of the gospel and therefore must be rejected as an heretical order. We must not draw any hasty conclusions, instead, we must exercise great patience; but, above all, we must not close our eyes to the importance of this problem. With this word of introduction we are ready to begin our investigation, wherein we must first of all explain what we understand by the ministry.

The church in all ages stands under the commission of her Lord to preach the gospel to all peoples and to administer the sacraments which he has instituted. This command takes two forms. In the first place, this commission of the Lord is addressed to each member of the church, who thereby has a share in the proclamation of the word and the administration of the sacraments and is thus under obligation to make use of them. This he can do to the degree in which he is gifted and within the limits of the opportunities and possibilities which are opened up to him. The second way in which the church fulfills her divine commission is by calling individual members who are capable, and entrusting to them the task of proclaiming the gospel and administering the sacraments through ordination by prayer and the laying on of hands.

The opportunities for the proclamation of the gospel and administration of the sacraments which are open to every member of the church are the following: 1) personal missionary witness in the individual's social context; 2) personal confession of faith whether it be in the sphere of one's private life or before the civic authorities as in times of persecution; 3) the instruction in the household by mother and father; 4) daily devotions in the home; 5) the encouragement of the penitent that they are forgiven in the *mutua consolatio fratrum*; 6) the congregational proclamation of the gospel in the services of worship through songs, psalms, hymns and praise; 7) the administration of the sacrament of baptism in emergencies; 8) the participation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and in the proclamation of Christ's death which it involves; 9) when a Christian finds himself in a place where there are no other Christians, he is challenged in a particularly new and urgent way to bear missionary witness to his faith. He must then pray that this witness will find as wide a reception as possible, and he must conduct himself as if he were sent to this place as a missionary by a congregation.

The church would disobey the command of her Lord if she only sought to propagate the faith by the first means. Therefore she must do more; she must formally commission individual members with the task of proclaiming the gospel and administering the sacraments through an historical act, ordaining them and sending them out as messengers of Jesus Christ. This "must" is a divine imperative and dare not be based upon the mere fact that it is expedient for the

church. This calling, commissioning, and sending out was instituted by the risen Lord with the same words with which he called his apostles.

The office into which the individual is installed by such a call, commissioning and sending takes two forms which are inter-related and which cannot be sharply distinguished from one another. The first form is that of the missionary who is sent to work among the heathen, the second is that of the pastor who is called to a congregation confined to one specific place. Without missionaries there could be no pastors. In this respect the missionary form of the office of the ministry is the basic one. In the exercise of his office, the missionary always has as his goal that the acceptance of the gospel in faith and the administration of the sacrament of baptism will result in the establishment of a local congregation. In this respect, the pastoral form of the office of the ministry is the ultimate one.

But even the pastor, within the confines of the place where he exercises his office, remains a missionary among those in his locality who do not yet believe. In like manner, the missionary as soon as he has baptized and remains among those baptized, becomes a pastor, just as the pastor dare not forget that for a given locale he is also a missionary. Therefore we can speak about the missionary ministry.

This ministry will change its historical character from time to time and from place to place. Think, for instance, of the great change which the historical form of the ministry underwent in the time of the Reformation, to say nothing at all about the changes which occurred between the time of the Pastoral Epistles and the Reformation! But despite all these changes, the missionary ministry must by its very nature, that is, by virtue of its divine commission, *de jure divino* include the following tasks, rights and powers which characterize the *ministerium ecclesiasticum* in its fullness: 1) the public proclamation of the gospel throughout the world; 2) the instruction of those desiring to be baptized; 3) the granting or withholding of baptism, the admitting to or excluding from the congregation and the Lord's Supper; 4) the preaching of the gospel and administration of the sacraments in the assembled congregation; 5) the preservation of the apostolic teaching which is the norm for all preaching and teaching, and the rejection of heresy which seeks to attack or destroy this norm; 6) the excommunication of heretics or those who persist in wrong-doing; 7) the bestowal of absolution upon those who in penitence have confessed their sins and who in faith desire to be forgiven and, if necessary, the renewed granting of Christian fellowship following the revocation of the excommunication; 8) the direction of the local church through the word of God in all areas, especially conducting the church's services of worship, exercising the care of souls in its variety of forms and the careful, responsible direction of the charitable activities of the church, everything that is included in the New Testament concept *episkopein*; 9) the responsibility for the transmission of the apostolic teaching and the pastoral office to the future generations; 10) the preservation and promotion of fellowship with the other apostolic churches, particularly with those who are "neighbors."

None of these functions can really be fulfilled by the pastor without the assistance of the members of the congregation, whether to a greater or lesser degree. The pastoral office is embedded in the many-sided charismatic ministries within the church, and it can only be fulfilled in conjunction with them. In order to strengthen one or the other of these functions it is possible to divide responsibilities and to create regular church offices besides that of the pastor such as that of the catechist, or that of the deacon who in a very special way takes over the care of the poor and those in need, or perhaps the responsibility for the discipline within the congregation can be shared with a group of the elders. Many other forms of assistance are possible. It is also conceivable that one function of the pastoral office deliberately be given up, in case it is to be exercised by another pastor whom human law places in a superior position. Such functions are the calling and ordaining of candidates to the ministry, the imposing and revoking of the ban of excommunication or the control over special services within the congregations. This in no way alters the fact that the tasks, rights and powers summed up in these ten points are included in the pastoral office by virtue of the original commission of Christ; they are not derived from the general priesthood of all believers, nor are they assumed by the pastor in the place of the faithful; instead they derive directly from the commission of the risen Lord and only in the pastoral office do they find their fullest expression.

The Lord has reserved for himself still a third method by which he can give his word to mankind, namely, the awakening of prophets. The prophet is exclusively and directly called to his prophetic ministry by God and not by men. It is impossible for the church to "ordain" one of its members to be a prophet. One either has the gift of prophecy or one does not have it; somewhat like the gift of healing. Aside from praying that it might appear, the church can do nothing to promote this gift. Over against this, in the specific sense of the word "charismatic," the church has the duty to test these spirits wherever they may appear, and then either to acknowledge the charismatic gifts and those who possess them as genuine through her Amen or to expose the pseudo-prophets and warn against them. The question as it now stands is this: can the theologically trained women be installed in the missionary ministry as we have here described it by being called, commissioned and sent through prayer and the laying on of hands?

It is beyond dispute in the Christian church, that the woman, as a Christian, can lay claim to the selfsame opportunities for the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments which are open and available to every other member of the church, as we have described them above. The woman is not a member of the congregation with lesser rank. In regard to the reception of the Holy Ghost and his gifts the woman, as woman, is in no way prejudiced against, since she is just as much a member of the body of Christ as is the man. According to Gal. 3:27 ff.: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond

nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." The human and historical differences which exist between people are no longer walls of division in Christ Jesus. In regard to the implanting in Christ, in regard to the sonship which is given through Christ, in regard to the promised inheritance and the reception of the Holy Spirit and his gifts, there is no difference between the baptized man and the baptized woman who live by faith in the gospel. But this, however, does not eliminate the fact that there are various ministries in the church, even such differences in ministries, for which the very fact of being man or being woman, which state is certainly not eradicated by baptism, can under certain circumstances be of great importance.²⁴

In what has just been said it is recognized that the gift of prophecy may also be given to women. The prophecy in Joel 3 which was fulfilled on Pentecost gives scriptural evidence thereof. It cannot be disputed that there were women in the apostolic age who preached as prophetesses in the churches, but yet one can notice that the prophetic activity of women is more or less restricted in the New Testament writings for reasons we shall not go into at the moment. Concentrating our attention upon the prophetesses of the primitive church will serve of no practical value in seeking a solution to our problem, since the ministry of the prophetess, just as that of the prophet, has its origin exclusively and directly in the inspiration of God the Holy Ghost, without any call, commission, or installation at the hands of man. Our question, however, concerns itself with just this point: whether women should thus be called, commissioned and installed by the church into the office of the missionary ministry. In order to answer this question we will have to consider the two New Testament passages which have a bearing upon the subject.

The meaning of I Tim. 2:11-15 is obvious: "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety."

The following observations are significant: Under teaching the apostle here understands, as one can already infer from the connection with the previous instructions concerning the correct conduct of the woman in worship, the public

²⁴ Therewith we touch upon the basic question around which, in the last analysis, Paul's controversy with the Corinthian women turned and which is also the central question upon which the ordination of women hinges today. We agree here with Fr. Zerbst. For him also the deciding factor rests in the theological determination of the relationship between man and woman in the orders of creation and redemption. In the present-day discussion of our problem he takes seriously those theological observations "which set the order of creation over against the order of redemption in such a manner that the former is obviated and superseded by the latter. When the sacramental and pneumatic aspects are stressed as decisive, then the order of creation appears legalistic, pre-Christian and irrelevant. The eschatological break-through of the kingdom of God cancels out the law and all ties on this earth and makes it possible for the kingdom to be realized here and now. Grounded in this kind of view are both the Corinthian theology and Liberalism; Montanism as well as the enthusiastic sects throughout the history of the church which maintain a strong eschatological orientation, the theological kingdom of God optimism as well as more recent New Testament-type conceptions, which so overestimate the enthusiastic, eschatological side of the New Testament, that all earthly ties just disappear in contrast to it. After what has been said in our above discussion it is not necessary for a detailed presentation, but it must be stressed that such attempts at a theological solution are neither justified on the basis of the New Testament nor are they systematically tenable" *op. cit.* p. 88.

teaching in the congregation assembled for worship, that is, what we would nowadays call "preaching." This activity is forbidden the woman, just because she is a woman, in a very solemn manner since it is written in the style used for formal decrees. The reason given for this prohibition points to the order which God himself had established at the creation: first the man and then the woman. Furthermore it refers to the different roles which man and woman played in the story of the fall. Both of these events of the proto-history, the creation and the fall, determine the status of contemporary woman, even the woman who is a Christian. The attitude which can be summed up in the concept "subject to" (hypotage) is seemly for her. The subjection which is demanded of her runs counter to the act of preaching in public. When a woman preaches in the worship services she steps out of the role of subordination which is demanded of her, and assumes by that act official authority over the man. Thus such preaching is a presumptuous abandonment of the *ordo* (*taxis*) in which even the Christian woman is placed by creation and the fall. Therefore the woman should not preach in the worship services.

One cannot doubt the general meaning of this text, even though individual points may lend themselves to variations of interpretation.²⁵ Much more difficult are the exegetical problems involved in I Cor. 14:33b-36: "As in all churches of the saints: let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for women to speak in the church. What? came the word of God out from you? or came it unto you only?" The following vv. 37 and 38, must be seen in the context of the entire chapter and yet they have a bearing upon the above passage,²⁶ therefore we must consider them here. "If any man think himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things that I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord."²⁷ But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant."

When we consider this passage only in the context of the 14th chap. of I Cor. it raises no exegetical difficulties worth mentioning; Paul bids the women to keep completely still in the assemblies of the congregation. He forbids them the right to talk, even if it be merely to ask questions arising from this or that sermon, or prophecy, or revelation which is being presented to the congregation. When he commands them to be silent and forbids their talking in general, he is at the same time denying them the right to prophesy, the regulation of which plays an important part in this chapter. The exegetical problem in this text is

²⁵ These variations center mainly around the meaning of the word *authenteln*, but they do not alter the general sense of the passage.

²⁶ Concerning the question of the original position of verses 34 and 35, see footnote 29.

²⁷ The written manuscript which is preferred by the exegetes reads: "... that that, which I write, is from the Lord." This says nothing more than our translation of the text. The variation between command in the singular and commandments in the plural is also unimportant for the meaning of the text. The plural "commandments" makes it easier to understand this text in relationship to the entire chapter. Should this not also be the case with the phrase "from the Lord"? If so, it would be in this, that an explicit command of Jesus preserved in the tradition (such as I Cor. 7:10) is certainly not at hand for the apostle's instructions in this chapter.

this: In I Cor. 11:2-16, Paul presupposes that the woman can pray and prophesy in the services of worship of the congregation. There he only demands that she keep her head covered, and he seems to have nothing against her praying and prophesying²⁸ if she obeys this regulation. How can he then demand that women keep silent in general and completely forbid their preaching and teaching as he does in I Cor. 14?

As far as I know there is no solution to this exegetical problem which is completely convincing. There are several proposals which are not convincing. One such is the proposal that verses 33b-36 are to be stricken as a later interpolation which originated in connection with I Tim. 2:11-15. This thesis was first proposed by Semmler (d. 1791). It was initially well received at the beginning of the century but is now held less often.²⁹ The conjecture that the prophesying and praying of women reported in I Cor. 11 was meant in the context of the home rather than the church is even less convincing. Others are of the opinion that the speaking which Paul forbids in I Cor. 14, is exclusively bound up with v. 35, namely, women are not to interrupt the sermons, prophecies, and revelations of men. The most common interpretation, however, is that Paul forbids women the right to preach, but not the right to prophesy under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, because this is something over which he has no jurisdiction. Nevertheless, he does try to order the direct activity of the Spirit: those who speak in tongues are commanded to keep silence when no interpreter is present (v. 28). Not more than two, or at the most three, who speak in tongues should be heard at any one congregational assembly (v. 27), therefore others present must keep silent. One possessed of charismatic gifts is requested to interrupt his preaching if anyone else suddenly receives a revelation (v. 30). "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" is the basic principle to be followed. A prophet can therefore prohibit his spirit from expressing itself if it be necessary for the sake of the peace and harmony of the congregation. Thus, one can with good reason conclude that the apostle also sought to bid the spirits of the prophetesses to keep silence in the congregation.³⁰

For our purposes, the question whether Paul in I Cor. 14 forbade women to prophesy as well, can, in view of the not wholly clear connection of our passage to I Cor. 11:2-16, remain open. Certainly Paul is forbidding women the right to that kind of preaching and teaching which depends upon deliberate preparation, such as is characteristic of a sermon, in contrast to the spontaneous and inspired utterances of those who speak in tongues, of prophets and of other charismatic personalities who depend upon the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

²⁸ It is no accident that v. 13 only speaks about prayer.

²⁹ Recently the thesis that our verse is a later interpolation out of the year 110 has been advanced again by Joh. Leiboldt (*Die Frau in der antiken Welt und in Urchristentum*, Leipzig, 1954, pp. 190 ff.) but without convincing reasons. The placing of vv. 34 and 35 after v. 40, as is done in various manuscripts, could have been prompted by the fact that v. 36 seems to fit directly after v. 33, while vv. 34 and 35 seem to disrupt the logical progression.

³⁰ Ernst Käsemann made reference to these observations at a committee meeting of the Confessing Church during the Second World War.

The really significant basis for the apostolic command to silence is the reference to the "subordination" (*Unterordnung*) which is demanded of the woman. Here our text and I Tim. 2:11 are in agreement. This subordination, with which we shall have to concern ourselves more thoroughly, is demanded by the law and is also based expressly upon the will of God. When Paul talks about the law, he is thinking here about such passages as Gen. 3:16 where God says to the woman after the fall: "The man shall rule over you." But this concept of subordination is seen by Paul in a much larger context. If the command to be subject is based upon the law, then the story of the creation in Gen. 2 also belongs to the law. A comparison with I Cor. 11:2-12 makes this clear.

It is not quite clear what standard St. Paul uses in judging the shamefulness of the conduct of the Corinthian women who spoke in the congregation. Quite often his instructions seem directly opposed to that which was the custom in the synagogue or in the Hellenistic world.⁸¹ When seen in relationship to their day, the New Testament injunctions against women taking an active role in the congregation represent exactly a rejection of those practices which were current in the social surroundings. Thus it is not all certain that Paul in this passage has taken as his standard one of the then prevailing value judgments as to what is decent and proper for a woman. It seems much more likely to me, that the reason behind Paul's considering this kind of conduct as shameful is because it violates the express will of God who demands such subordination. This will of God which finds expression in the law is also in a sense written upon the hearts of the heathen, so that a "natural" feeling of propriety plays a role in determining what is or is not shameful; but it by no means provides the real basis from which the apostolic injunction judges that which is respectable or non-respectable.

The reference to the order which prevails in other congregations is of special significance in this passage. One could call it Paul's "ecumenical" argument. Already in chap. 11:16 he had stressed it with a very positive firmness, and here it seems to enclose the command to silence as in bonds of brass. In v. 36, Paul, with an almost ironical sharpness, refers as proof for his views to the order which exists without exception in the other churches, as cited already in v. 33b. It is almost as if he is shouting to the Corinthians: "Who do you think you are? Do you think that you deserve special regulations? Must I really remind you that you are only one part of the larger church?" The word of God did not originate in Corinth, and it did not come only to the Corinthians. The church at Corinth, because of her dependence upon the apostolic message, is also dependent upon the church as a whole. She is not autonomous nor does she have her own head! And she can give evidence of her dependence by acknowledging the general rule which prevails in the Christian church regarding the place of women.

⁸¹ In this way Paul decides against the Jewish custom in the question of covering the head. With the command to silence he separates the practice of the Christian congregation from the cultic practices which are found in Hellenistic religions and in Gnosticism.

Finally, however, Paul emphasizes that his instructions concerning the speaking of women in the church are not made solely on the basis of his apostolic authority, but on the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. Behind the authority of the apostle stands the authority of the Lord. It is not by accident that Paul, in his controversy with the charismatic spirits in Corinth, rests his arguments for church and liturgical order not merely upon his own apostolic authority, but brings Christ into the debate. He sees this question of a woman's conduct in the church not as something peripheral, but as involving the whole of Christian faith. Paul judges whether true prophecy and truly charismatic spirits exist in the Corinthian church by their agreement with his instructions. It is also not a matter about which there can be valid differences of opinion. Here, as in I Cor. 11:16, the apostolic character of the Corinthian church is at stake, and its reaction to this problem will ultimately determine whether it remains within the folds of the apostolic church or becomes a syncretistic sect.

When one glances over these arguments of Paul, one sees that each increases in weight, in order to stress the importance of this command to silence. This shows that we have to do here with something which is central to the faith. This very important matter, on which both being "Christian" and being "church" depend, confronts us in the concept of subordination which St. Paul demands in the case of the Corinthian women and which is his strongest argument. What actually is meant when the New Testament speaks of subordination?

First of all it is clear that we are dealing with a theological and not with a sociological relationship. Whatever this subordination might mean in its various aspects, one thing is sure, it is based on the will of God, that is, it comes from God, and is a divine and not a human arrangement; it is not the product of a particular social structure, but is a preordained order given by God to which all historical development is bound. Such a theological factor obviously has sociological consequences in its realization; where it is accepted and translated into actual practice the results are helpful and blessed; and where men try to oppose it because of their own self-pride the result is destruction and judgment.

The nature of this "ordering under" is actually an "ordering into" (*Einordnung*). A divinely instituted order is presupposed (*taxis*) which must be acknowledged and accepted by a concrete practical conduct of life. This being subject is first of all part of the divinely given order whereby it is mediated to the individual in question.³²

Here we have to do with a structure which goes far beyond the relationship between man and woman. Even the relationship of Christ to God, the relationship of the Holy Spirit to Christ, the relationship of the church to Christ is

³² See Karl Barth: *Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III/4, p. 192. The whole section, pp. 192-196, is of significance to our discussion of order and subordination. A critical discussion concerning the thesis of Barth is not possible within the confines of this essay. The critical reader will not have failed to observe that we have attempted to incorporate many of the observations of Barth even though we cannot follow him at many important points and therefore come to a different conclusion in the question of the ordination of women than he does.

determined by this fundamental principle of being set within and subject to an order which was instituted by God from the beginning. I Cor. 11:2-16 and Eph. 5:22-33 show the wider context in which this ordering and sub-ordering of the woman is placed. Only in I Cor. 11 the keyword "subordination" is missing. But there the structure is revealed into which the practical conduct of being subordinated fits. This basic structure is a "*kephale*-structure." The man is the head of the woman; Christ is the head of the man; God is the head of Christ. The "head" is that which is prior, that which determines, that which leads. The head is the power which begins, it is *principium*, *arche*. This being the head differs depending upon the structure in which it finds itself. In any case, it involves the kind of relationship for which one can never substitute a polar *schema*.

Let us look a little more closely at the relationship between man and woman as it stands within this chain. The most significant passage in this connection is I Cor. 11:8: "For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." The order which prevails between man and woman is not one which has developed in the course of history; it was established by God from the beginning of all things and was given in the creation. What it means for man to be man and the woman to be woman is defined by the "*kephale*-structure" which governs their relationships, a structure which is given once for all and not derived. Paul is thinking here of the account of the creation in Gen. 2. There is no reason to assume that the relationship between man and woman described there does not correspond to the full intention of God at the creation, but represents merely the temporary beginning of a course of development which must strive to attain the high estate anticipated in the first creation narrative, Gen. 1.³³ We will see that the relation which creation set between man and woman also participates in the history which God carries through with man for his salvation, and that it is carried along by this history even into the transformation at the resurrection. But it is just this relationship, which was established from the origin of all things, which runs through various modalities; it, however retains its God-given ontological structure until the final transformation in the resurrection from the dead.

With this we have already intimated how we are to understand Gen. 2 in relationship to the apostle's own explanation thereof. The story of the creation of woman in Gen. 2 is certainly not meant to be the account of an anthropological event which can be empirically investigated. It expresses, instead, a hidden but yet very actual fundamental relationship between the sexes. One can attempt

³³ This sentence is directed at M. E. Thrall. According to him the position of the woman in relationship to the man and to the image of God as God wills it can only be ascertained from Gen. 1, because the insight of Gen. 2 represents an incomplete intermediate stage of thought. According to Thrall, what Gen. 1 says about man and woman and the image of God corresponds to the new being in Christ in which the Christian is decisively set through baptism. What Gen. 2 says about the position of the woman in God's creation corresponds to the apostolic instructions which have a "growing-into" this new being in mind and which presuppose a "not-yet," a "becoming," and a "not yet fulfilled." The "Adam and Eve myth" can therefore never be accepted as "a true picture of the perfect state of human personality and human relations." The subordination of the woman based on Gen. 2 is therefore "only a stage in human development," but no permanent command for Christians. (See *ibid.*, pp. 32-36.) I cannot see how this concept can be harmonized with the basic thought of Paul, and I also cannot find grounds for it in Gen. 1 and 2.

to understand the pre-existence of this order by analogy to the, in principle, axiological givenness of a Platonic idea. Such an attempt is certainly more faithful to the biblical claim than the attempt to discredit the actual import of this biblical insight by passing it off as the result of naivete and an unscientific attitude. A minimum of theological understanding for the text, in any case, presupposes the recognition that the relationship between man and woman is determined through and through by a fundamental divine law, which is axiologically fore-ordained and which transcends all experience while at the same time influencing it. But the biblical text goes further. It leads to the conviction that this order of God, just as surely as in every instant it acts from out of its "axiological transcendence" as a basic law, is essentially something other than such a law. It is a saving act of God done at the origin of all things. Its proto-historical reality is not testified to by a doctrine of ideas, nor by a mythological description of the mystery of the ideas; proclamation must be made of a history which took place on earth once at the beginning, in which God once and for all time acted on and with mankind.

What then is the actual relationship between man and woman according to this fundamental order? The structure of the relationship can be defined by the two prepositional phrases "from" and "for the sake of." This relationship cannot be understood as a polar relationship in which the roles are interchangeable. Because the relationship between man and woman has the nature of a *kephale*-structure the position of each in its created existence differs from that of the other for all time. Their positions cannot be interchanged. The original creaturely "from" and "for the sake of" relates to the woman; the reverse is not possible! To be sure in the sequence of birth the man does come from woman (I Cor. 11:11). This fact of life constitutes an important counterpart to the order established in the creation where the woman derives from man. But this counterpart is not able to cancel out the order which was given in the creation and which is in every respect prior to the succession of the generations, whereby the woman comes from the man and is there for his sake. According to her created basis the woman comes from the man, and according to his created basis he is the "head" of the woman. Both man and woman according to their foundation in the creation, under which all other characteristics are subsumed, are subject to this order with its *kephale*-structure. As a result of this order the woman is related to the man through the original creaturely associations of "from" and "for his sake" and therefore she in a unique way is subject to him as her "head." Only where the woman in her concrete practical relationships lives what she is by virtue of the creaturely existence given her in the creation is she a woman as God meant her to be and still wants her to be.

The unique *kephale*-structure of the relationship between man and woman is also evident in the event of the fall, although an important modification occurs here. According to Gen. 3 and I Tim. 2:14 (see also II Cor. 11:3) the share which man and woman had in the event of the original fall differed. Even

the relationship of the man to the command of God around which the transgression centered, Gen. 2: 16-18, differs from that of the woman. The man originally received these words; therefore he is the first witness to them. He is entrusted with the preservation and transmission of these words. Luther could very pictorially describe how Adam preached in Paradise, while Eve listened. According to Gen. 2 Eve can only know these words of God which were spoken at the creation of man because Adam has borne witness to them. Already in the Garden of Eden Adam is ordered to be the preacher and the responsible custodian of God's words by virtue of his place in the creation.

It is no accident that the first transgression in the human world occurred through the woman. She is less capable of preserving these original words of God since she did not hear the word of God directly from his mouth, but received it via the word of man. On the other hand, the responsibility of man and his consequent guilt are essentially greater than hers. Certainly one cannot take the sentence found in I Tim. 2:14 and attempt to press it into a polar scheme by saying: "Adam fell through Eve, Eve fell through Adam." One can and must say, however, that the fall into sin was finally fulfilled by the act of the man. Not until the deed of the man did the fall into sin become ripe for judgment. The first Adam proved himself also to be the "head," in that sin and death entered into the world through him. The statement in I Tim. 2:14 must be amplified by Rom. 5:12 and this must be said: to be sure Adam was led astray through Eve, but through Adam the fall was "fulfilled."

One of the consequences of the judgment upon this original fall was the modification of the *kephale*-structure which determines the relationship between man and woman. A uniquely painful hardness now enters into this relationship under which the woman especially must suffer. Instead of the man being the "head" of the woman, he now, according to Gen. 3:16, becomes a ruler who possesses her. The original association of the woman to the man is now transformed into a subjugation to his desire which has an almost oppressive power.

Christ, however, redeems this *kephale*-structure which governs man and woman. In Christ the afore-mentioned balance is fully worked-out, in that the man proceeds from the woman in the sequence of birth. (I Cor. 11: 11 ff.) In Christ the *kephale*-structure can be described by the paradoxical formula "be subject one to another" (Eph. 5:21). But this in no way means that in Christ the *kephale*-structure given in the creation is now cancelled out. On the contrary! In Christ this structure is seen again in its original sense, it is released from the hardness which entered in at the fall and receives a content which first came into the world through Christ's reconciling act on the cross and which can be summarized in one word—*agape*, love. A text such as Eph. 5:22-33 shows how the relationship between man and woman which is realized in marriage has received an eschatological quality through Christ, while retaining the original *kephale*-structure. Therefore the relationship between man and woman is compared to the relationship between Christ and his church! When considering the relationship of Christ to his church

one cannot speak of a polar relationship. Here, with absolute finality, the body is body and the head is head, unchangeable and unexchangeable. The relationship between Christ and his church also includes the difference between he who as true God from all eternity is born of God and those who to all eternity are creatures by virtue of their creation. But how deeply here the head inclined itself! Christ offered himself up for his church. How close is the relationship between the head and his church even though the differences are still maintained, so close that one can say that the two are one body. In this analogical relation, the man is purposely accorded the place of Christ, and the woman the place of the church. What the subordination of the woman to the man really means within the *kephale*-structure is made clear by the subordination of the church to Christ. The woman is subject to the man as the church is subject unto Christ, and precisely for this reason. The man is the head of the woman, just as Christ is head of his church; therefore the man should love the woman just as Christ has loved his church.

Three events join in a mysterious way to determine the relationship of man and woman to each other: the creation in the beginning, the original fall into sin with the resulting judgment upon it, and the saving act of Christ with its fruits. The closest event to us is the deed of Christ. In its light we not only see the origin of the relationship between man and woman, but also that which is not as yet. The eschatological transformation in the resurrection from the dead has not yet taken place. The relationship between man and woman must still bear the fundamental elements of the *kephale*-structure which were given in the creation. According to the testimony of the New Testament, the reception of the pledge of the transformation, the reception of the Holy Spirit and his gifts, does not obviate these basic creaturely elements, even though it begins to transform them. The struggle between the spirit and the flesh shows that the consequences of the judgment upon sin are not eliminated from the experience of the Christian who is a new being in Christ, even though all is forgiven. It is to the credit of Luther's Reformation theology for having brought this actual state of affairs to the light with persistent clarity. Therefore there is no relapse into "pre-Christian" thought when the apostolic admonitions to the woman are based not only upon the creation but also upon Gen. 3, vv. 6 and 16. Decisive, however, is the acknowledgement that the *kephale*-structure of the relationship between man and woman which was given at the creation has not been obviated by the event of Christ, but has finally come into the light and has been brought into its own with new power and in a new way.

From I Cor. 11:3 and 7 we see that the *kephale*-structure of the relationship between man and woman is incorporated into a whole chain of such structural relationships. Wherever the original "from" and "for the sake of" governs the relationship between persons or spiritual forces, the *kephale*-structure is in effect. On all levels this structure demands that both partners in the relationship be incorporated into its order, which for the one partner implies a personal subordination

to the other partner, the one to whom the "from" and "for the sake of" applies. This subordination, this New Testament "hypotage" is on all levels something inclusive, something total, a unified mode of behavior which determines all actions, but which in particular instances manifests itself as a subordination. In its totality as well as in individual actions it is related to the head which determines this relationship, and from whom its particular characteristics come. The subordination of Christ to the Father is a unique relationship which does not occur anywhere else. The same holds true for the subordination of the church to Christ and for that of the woman to the man. In all of these cases we have to do with subordination, but yet each one is something unique. This shows that we are dealing here with something which is at the same time both similar and yet different, which is both different and yet similar. Neither the difference nor the similarity dare be neglected. Therefore a certain conformity runs through all of the various ways of subordination. The subordination which is demanded of the woman reveals a structure which is projected into the christological depths of the saving history of God. Therefore the preservation of the *kephale*-structure for the relationship between the man and the Christian woman is nothing strange, as though it contradicted her being a Christian, her being in Christ! Instead, the maintaining of this structure on the level of relationships between man and woman actually corresponds to that which exists between the church and Christ, yes, even to that between Christ and the Father. Despite the individual differences of the various forms of subordination, the subordination of the woman to the man is mysteriously bound up with the subordination of the church to Christ, and Christ to the Father. What is "subordination" for the Lord Jesus Christ is reflected in the subordination which is demanded of the woman, and she may see it in the light of the relationship between the church and Christ and between the Father and the Son. The Christian woman could not mistake or belie the dignity which is hers in a more basic manner than by attempting to step out of the *kephale*-structure which governs her relationship with the man and by trying to usurp and assume the place accorded to him either in the church or in marriage.

With these considerations we have laid the ground for the first dogmatic theological decision which our theme demands. It is this: The *kephale*-structure governing the relationship between man and woman, which was given in the creation and the command to subordination (hypotage) which is demanded of the woman in a unique way by this order are in effect in the Christian church until the Last Judgment. Were any one to contest in teaching and preaching the factual and effective existence of this order and the factual validity of the corresponding command, he would be proclaiming a false teaching in regard to this central point with which the whole Christian message hangs together; he would be a heretic.

One dares to hope that the Lutheran churches are still united on this point. But what does this decision mean for our question regarding the ordination of

women to the pastoral office? Now arises the special ethical question, how are we to apply this theological principle today, and how are we to proclaim and to make concrete the command which corresponds to it?

Do the marriage laws of the German Federal Republic by any chance contradict this theological principle? Does the practice in our society whereby women appear in the secular courts as lawyers and even, as judges pass sentences over others, contradict it? Is the subordination demanded of the woman contradicted by the practice whereby women are elected as representatives to legislative assemblies and thus not only speak out concerning, but also make decisions on civil laws, and perhaps even hold posts in the ruling cabinet? Can a woman so exercise the above mentioned activities in a manner which maintains the subordination commanded of her?

It ought to be obvious that the application of our theological principle and the actualization of its corresponding demand will in many respects have to take an entirely different form today than in the 2nd, or perhaps, the 16th centuries. The church will therefore have to carefully see to it, of course always with Christian freedom, that this principle and its demands are observed by her members in the realm of civic and political life. It is quite obvious that a danger threatens, which is here coupled with a great deal of insecurity and confusion; for here an area worthy of notice exists, in which a variety of concrete decisions are possible by individuals and groups with the same ties. But no preacher of the gospel and no theology professor would in our present European situation find himself in the position to flatly refuse a Christian woman the right to participate in the governmental activity of both city and state on the basis of the word of God. The exercise of such activity does not contradict the "subordination" which is demanded of the woman.³⁴

One might be tempted to go on from here and draw similar conclusions in regard to the ministry of the woman in the church. Does not the subordination demanded of the woman also need to be reformulated in terms of church life? Granted, that for Paul very much, perhaps even the very existence of the gospel itself, hung in the balance because of the behavior of the Corinthian women in the congregation, so that he had to take a firm stand on women wearing a head-covering and keeping silent in worship, does that necessarily mean that his instructions are still valid for our situation? In regard to the head-covering, the decision has long been made. Could not the woman also preach the gospel and administer the sacraments today without damaging the subordination which is required of her? Here we have a very pointed formulation of the controversy which is so deeply moving the Lutheran churches today.

³⁴ One must notice that even for Johann Gerhard women are not necessarily excluded from the exercise of public offices. He acknowledges all kinds of legitimate reasons why women should exercise the *majestas imperii* in the realm of worldly affairs. He even allows for *exempla quaedam heroicarum feminarum extraordinaria*. Such women can also in an *electio libera*, be installed in the secular government provided that eligibility is not restricted to a particular family. (See *Locus XX*, no. 42, *Locus XXIV*, no. 110. Ed. Preuss, IV, 278, VI, 314 ff.)

There exists, indeed, unanimity of opinion that the subordination which is required of the woman must find such a concrete expression in the life of the church as corresponds to the social and religious situation. In the Lutheran churches there is general agreement on the necessity to distinguish between that which transpires in the secular realm and that which transpires in the spiritual realm. An argument which believes it can derive a case for the ordination of women from the changed position of the woman in modern society has no validity in the church; it cannot be advanced as proof that the ordination of the woman to the pastoral office is in harmony with the subordination required of her. On the other hand, the opposite also does not follow from this recognition. In my opinion, the deciding factor in this controversy is a dogmatic question which is directly connected with the fundamental dogmatic principle asserted above. This question must be raised in the light of the spiritual authority involved in the exercise of the pastoral ministry. The question then is: Can this spiritual authority be exercised by a woman in the assembled *ecclesia* without repudiating the *kephale*-structure of the order in which the woman stands, *eo ipso*, that is by the very act of exercising such authority, and thereby also damaging a concrete ethical consummation of the subordination which is implied in this order and its corresponding command?

Before I give my answer, two misunderstandings or errors must be dealt with. It would be a misunderstanding were one to say: it may be the case that a married woman would violate the *kephale*-structure which is present in marriage were the church to consecrate her as pastor, but in the case of an unmarried woman this obstruction no longer holds true because she does not have a man who *in concreto* would be her head. The misunderstanding which underlies this conception has its origin in the failure to recognize that although the *kephale*-structure does receive its most concrete and fulfilled realization in marriage, every man or woman by virtue of being man or woman is determined by and is responsible to this order even in case of actual and permanent celibacy. The state of being man or woman, even when unmarried, is subject to the working power of this creaturely existence given directly by God and to the basic order which precedes all personal existence. The difference between married and single has absolutely no dogmatic relevance for the decision involved in our controversy.

The second misunderstanding goes somewhat deeper; it already contains an important theological error. Here the command to subordination is understood as a moral demand which everyone can accept for himself through his own personal decision and inner attitude, without reference to any universal existential order. The moral decision is here completely independent of any pre-existent order and falls completely within the realm of inner self-determination. The conviction which obviously underlies this conception is that what we have called the *kephale*-structure in the relationship between man and woman is in the last analysis determined by my own inner moral decision; that is, a divine order which precedes my own decision and which is a part of my very being as a creature

does not exist at all. The pre-existence of such an order is not at all an existence which lays a claim upon me without my prior moral decision, for it only involves my existence through my moral decision. This conception can lead to the opinion that an ordained woman is fulfilling the demand of subordination placed upon her when she exercises her office in true Christian humility and in the proper relationship to the total congregation, free from all desires for emancipation and free from all presumptions about the office.

The error behind this conception lies in the fact that it fails to acknowledge the creative power of the word of God spoken at the creation. It fails to realize the fact that God by virtue of his act of salvation has set certain conditions in our existence which are incessantly effectual by virtue of the divine arrangement. What is overlooked here is the fact that the *kephale*-structure of the relationship between man and woman is no less objective, no less factual and no less a part of existence than the fact that there is a male and female sex given in an order which spans us all.

The decisive question with which we are concerned must be formulated with respect to the authority which is exercised in the pastoral ministry. This unique authority of the pastoral office is evidenced particularly at three points: 1) in those specific actions involving church order such as the basic admitting to the Lord's table, also in the occasional admitting by giving the Lord's Supper, and in the excluding from the Lord's Supper and the fellowship of the church; 2) in the public declaration of true doctrine and in the public rejection of false doctrine; 3) in the public proclamation of the gospel in the assembled congregation.

The authority which is exercised in these acts and which culminates in the public proclamation of the gospel is a spiritual eschatological (*endzeitliche!*) authority of the highest kind. There, where the pastor exercises the functions instituted with his office by divine mandate, as we have shown above, he stands in the place of Christ, serving as the official messenger of Christ. When the pastors perform their office by virtue of the divine institution, the word of the Lord holds true for them just as it did for the apostles: "He who hears you, hears me." (Luke 10:16). This is clearly the teaching of the Lutheran confessional standards.³⁵ In the exercise of the duties involved in his ministry the pastor—even though he be a hypocrite or an evil person—represents the Lord Jesus Christ himself. Only concerning heretics must it be said: *hi iam non funguntur persona Christi*—they no longer represent Christ (Apol. VII, 48). The pastor does not represent the church, he actually represents Christ, even though the church has installed him into this office in which he represents Christ.

The decisive question for our discussion must now be formulated in this manner: Can a woman who as such is determined by the *kephale*-structure and analogically but really holds in it the place of the church, stand at the same time in the place of Christ as a pastor of the church and as his fully credited ambassador,

³⁵ See CA XXVIII, 21 f.; Apol. VII, 28 and 47; XII, 40; Tract. 18 sq.

while in that very same *kephale*-structure, the man, by virtue of his creation in the image and glory of God and Christ (I Cor. 11:3 and 7) as well as by virtue of the redemption (Eph. 5:25), stands as head in the place corresponding to that of Christ? Can a woman in a regular manner—extraordinary acts of God in extraordinary situations and the awakening of prophetesses are not under consideration here—as pastor exercise over the church the highest form of spiritual authority within the realm of canonical law, which implies exercising it over a section of mankind and thereby over the man, without running into a basic existential conflict with her created (and thereby transparent for the history of salvation) being as woman? Do not being “pastor” and being “woman” contradict one another?

We are talking here about a conflict in being, which is not necessarily equivalent to a psychological, empirically verifiable conflict. The conflict with which we are concerned is carried on in the very depths and basis of created being. These depths are so hidden that only God's word and the eye of the witness of Christ's resurrection can tell us of them. In this respect the depths and basis of being with which we are here concerned share in the hiddenness and mystery of original sin. This conflict between being “pastor” and being “woman” is so hidden that empirical symptoms thereof are perhaps not apparent for a long time, perhaps not for an entire generation. It is quite possible that the combination of woman and the office of pastor might for a long time, as far as one can empirically ascertain, be accompanied by the best of results. But finally the day will come when this conflict which is building up in the hidden depths of created being will manifest its great force even through empirical symptoms. In the long run it will eventually take its toll in the total cultural structure of an era.

This formulation of our decisive question already contains its own answer. If we see this question in the light of the observations which we have already made, we must come to the following conclusion: the biblical message about woman, as it is available to us in the applicable interpretation of the apostolic statements and the biblical word concerning the pastoral office, as it is defined in the teachings of our confessional standards, show that the combination of being “woman” and being “pastor” contradict one another in a manner which involves the woman in the hidden depths of her created being in a conflict which attacks her very being. This conflict roots in the fact that the combination of pastoral office and being woman objectively and fundamentally destroys the *kephale*-structure of the relationship between man and woman and therefore also rejects the “ordering into” and “subordination to” (hypotage) which is demanded by God's will. That which contradicts the spiritual and creaturely order with which God has invested being cannot be the good which God wills! God does not contradict himself in creation and redemption. The apostolic command to silence, as we find it in I Cor. 14 and I Tim. 2, cannot be explained away as the result of the peculiar theological speculation of its author, who was

bound by the cultural history and the special circumstances of his day. These instructions are based much more on certain hidden, but yet extraordinarily incisive, fundamental laws and commands which God himself established in the creation and substantiated in the carrying out of his saving counsel. These fundamental laws and commands stand directly behind the apostolic command to silence. Our dogmatic analysis has shown that the ordination of women to the ministry according to a ruling of canonical law attacks these fundamental laws and commands of God. Only God can, in an unusual manner and by extraordinary means, go beyond these basic orders and commands which all Christians in all places and at all times are bound to respect. The church must exercise extreme caution in maintaining that in a particular concrete situation such an extraordinary intervention of God has taken place. In churches which at this time are not suffering under persecution or are not blessed with the awakening of prophets in their midst, such an intervention is highly unlikely. In such churches women should not be ordained to the pastoral office.

On the other hand, one must remember that the pastor cannot exercise his office without assistance. To a certain extent he can be relieved of some of the functions included in his office and the responsibility for them can be taken over by capable members of the congregation. These forms of assistance can be organized and carried out as offices within the church. The warrant therefore is already contained in the New Testament. And women can also assume such an official service in the church. In the ancient church the orders for widows and deaconesses which go back to apostolic times (see I Tim. 5:9-16; and probably also 3:11) were such offices for women in the church. With no dogmatic difficulties, the following functions can be separated from the pastoral office and can be organized into such an official assisting ministry into which a woman with theological training can be installed through prayer and the laying on of hands:

- 1) the Christian instruction of the catechumens, also confirmation instruction, above all the training of groups of members, also the introduction to the interpretation of the Scriptures which takes the form of a Bible study;
- 2) baptizing those who have been approved by the pastor of the congregation, and the dispensing of the cup at the Lord's Supper;³⁶
- 3) home visitations and visits to the sick with the care and counseling which is involved, in fact, individual counseling, particularly with women, and also in hospitals and prisons;

³⁶ With this last proposal we pick up an important liturgical function of the ancient deacon. This function in the service should not be prohibited to women. The separation of the distribution of the cup from the *administration* of the sacrament, which is reserved for the pastor, has nothing whatever to do with a devaluation of the "second form." Christ's blood is not less precious than his body. The basis of this rule is that a decisive act of church government is connected with the distribution of the bread—admission to the celebration. In an extreme case a refusal may be necessary at the very altar. A woman should not be permitted to exercise this authority of admission. This governmental factor is not present with the distribution of the cup. Anyone who has received the bread from the pastor has been unequivocally admitted. Therefore the cup can be brought also by a woman.

- 4) devotions in houses such as retreat centers, hospitals, prisons, and charitable institutions;
- 5) assisting in the training of other official orders such as catechists, congregational helpers, deacons and deaconesses;
- 6) cooperating in the maintenance of correct doctrine through theological research.

Those functions of the pastoral office which for dogmatic reasons cannot be transferred to women by a canonical ruling, but which must be exercised solely by the pastor, are the following:

- 1) preaching in the worship services of the congregation;
- 2) leading the services of worship;
- 3) the administration of the sacraments in the worship services;
- 4) the decision as to who is to be admitted to the Lord's Supper; the imposing of the degree of excommunication and its revocation;
- 5) the granting of absolution in the confessional;
- 6) the acts of confirmation and ordination;
- 7) jurisdiction over the supporting ministries and the assistants in the local church, the *episkope*;
- 8) the exercise of the office of diocesan bishop.

These two lists of functions, by which we have attempted to distinguish between the office of a theologically trained woman and that of the pastor, while at the same time showing their relationship to one another, is in no way intended to be conclusive. These lists, and the limitations which they involve will be only partially understandable on the basis of the previous dogmatic discussion. They could only be based upon a dogmatic discussion of the respective individual functions, but this is not possible here, and anyway it is not necessary to our discussion. The purpose of these lists is merely to make concrete the fundamental insights which have resulted from our discussion. When the basic theological question involved in the controversy concerning the ordination of women to the pastoral ministry is acknowledged and correctly decided, the form which the office of a theologically trained woman in the church will take, its distinction from that of the pastoral office, and its relationships thereto, will no longer present any great difficulties.

FROM THE WORK OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION AND THE ECUMENICAL WORLD

World Mission

Commission on World Mission, July 29 - August 6, 1959

THE COMMISSION ON WORLD MISSION met this year at Nyborg Strand in Denmark. As usual, an agenda of formidable size had been handed over to the delegates in advance which provided them with useful reading on the journey. A better place for conferences is rarely found, and the warm summer of 1959 helped to create the healthy atmosphere of recreation at the seaside without which the heavy work in plenary sessions and endless committee meetings could easily have caused irritation instead of good fellowship as it now did.

Theology in Theory

The subjects chosen for special lectures were THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION and INTER-CHURCH AID AND MISSION.

There is no gainsaying the fact that the subjects were controversial at least in the way they were presented by the speakers. Dr. Vajta, Director, Dept. of Theology, LWF, gave prominence to the need of indigenous theology not merely as a translation from the West but as "rethinking the gospel in the context of a new culture." He referred to the history of the early church as an example of a fresh conception of the gospel in a new language and in a different cultural surrounding. A simple translation of theological literature of the West will not meet the need in Asia and in Africa. Research work must be done by men from the younger churches with relevance to their situation, and they would be wise to study patristics which the speaker was convinced had much to say and to teach them.

Dr. Vajta also touched upon the problem of interconfessional schools for the training

of the ministry and warned against the isolation of Lutheran theology. The problem was dealt with elsewhere in the conference from the point of view of its financial implications, since the plans for higher theological education in East Africa would take different shape if money from the Theological Education fund was forthcoming. That again raised the question of confessional or interconfessional training.

Mr. Vaagen, Gen. Secretary, Norwegian Lutheran Mission, was the second speaker on the subject. He pointed to the gifts of grace as indispensable prerequisites of a pastor and said "theological training must be practised in harmony with this principle." Mr. Vaagen said that he realized the need for acquiring scientific theology but he would warn "against making this standard a precondition for pastoral training in the younger churches." He therefore came to the conclusion "that both the biblical lines and practical considerations point to simpler and smaller seminaries, where due attention can be paid to the student's gift of grace." If young men are sent to far off places for academic studies they will often be estranged from their surroundings at home and perhaps fitted as pastors for the cultural elite only. For financial reasons also, there should be simpler seminaries closely connected with the church. Theological seminaries of a higher academic standard ought to be few in number.

Theology in Practice

Theological questions occupied a great deal of our time. Indirectly, Mr. Vaagen gained support for his hesitation about more academic theological seminaries from the reports of the All Africa Theological Seminar at Marangu. Due to the varying degrees of academic background the present set of students had not benefited as much as it was hoped they would. The curriculum could not be worked out so as to satisfy all the students. The

meeting resolved to appoint an advisory committee to assist the faculty. An encouragement to local seminaries is the blessing which the CWM gave to the seminary project at Rustenburg in South Africa just because the need for locally trained pastors is so great.

The need for higher and more thorough theological education was, however, evident and made itself felt everywhere. For the Far East the CWM found reason to recommend discussion on theological education with representatives from Hong Kong, Malaya, and Taiwan with the view to raising the standard, which could be done through the exchange of professors. The Makumira Theological School in Tanganyika, for which encouraging reports were presented, should be brought up to college level. The number of students is on the increase. This year there were 60 and in 1960 there will be 70. The situation in Africa demands more highly qualified pastors and consequently higher scales of pay.

In line with this tendency came the scheme for a theological training program at Makerere University with the possible participation of Tanganyika Lutherans. The Federation of Lutheran Churches in Tanganyika had turned down the proposal but on fresh consideration the CWM found it "to be in the interest of

- (a) East Africa as a whole;
- (b) the role of the universal church in East Africa;
- (c) the future of the Lutheran church in East Africa,"

that efforts be made to find a basis on which Lutherans could co-operate in the scheme. The commission went on to propose certain arrangements as necessary to the formation of such a basis. There should be a provision for the acceptance of teachers of minority denominations on the faculty and also facilities for corporate worship according to the liturgical order of the respective churches and for provision of pastoral care for groups of students by representatives of their respective churches.

Cooperation-union

A door was opened to the cooperation within the larger sphere of the church universal with the decision on the Makerere scheme. In this connection reference should be made to a paper read at the conference which was of great interest also from the

point of view of theology. The consultations between representatives of the Church of South India and of the Federation of Lutheran Churches in India carried on for ten years and more, have produced results of considerable importance in the matter of church unity. In April 1959 the Theological Commission had agreed on a statement on "the church ministry" whereby they had, so to speak, laid the top stone to a building of confessional unity. Representatives of the FELC in India read records of rejoicing on the part of the Lutheran churches over this achievement with the prospect of church union in view. The CWM shared in the joy but did not at this stage want to commit itself to the prospect of union in view of the practical problems that still have to be solved.

A bolder stand was taken with regard to the union scheme for the Lutheran churches in Natal. Things are moving fast in South Africa, and a Union Committee has not only agreed on a constitution but also announced their intention to call the first synod of the church to meet in 1960. Thereby the supporting missions are placed in a situation where decisions on arrangement of work and above all on close cooperation of the missionary efforts will have to be made very soon.

In order to pave the way a special sub-committee was asked to draw up a memorandum giving the various bodies concerned some suggestions to work at. While mainly dealing with practical arrangements the memorandum also hinted at the necessity, even in this case, of laying a foundation of "sound understanding of the spiritual and doctrinal unity which must form the basis of the church."

The Mission of the Church

Another matter of great importance from the point of view of theology was on the agenda of the meeting. The CWM had found it necessary once more to place before the Commission a statement on "the mission of the church" which had been drafted after the last meeting and was commented upon by the different churches and missions during the year. Even now some amendments were proposed, especially with a view to clarifying the different tasks facing the church at home and abroad. But otherwise the statement was released as a statement of

the Commission. The spirit of the contents can be gauged from the following theses:

The mission of the Church addresses itself to man in his totality ministering to both spiritual and physical needs.

The mission of the Church bears witness to the universality of the Gospel, which is relevant for all peoples and nations.

The mission of the Church is an essential function of the life of the Christian community.

The mission of the Church is the common task of the Christians of all races and in all parts of the world, and is directed to the whole world.

Inter-church Aid

On inter-church aid and mission, lectures were given by one representative of each, viz. Dr. B. Hoffman and Dr. F. Birkeli. Can the term inter-church aid be substituted for world mission? Or do we thereby lose a spiritual quality in the activity of the church for which the concept of mission is a safeguard? These were the somewhat pointed questions that arose from the lectures and the ensuing discussion.

The conference left the questions open but stressed the need for close co-operation in actual service. There was no lack of evidence that the work of the mission in its social aspect was also within the purview of inter-church aid, nor of the desire on the part of inter-church aid to have its work recognized as prompted by the same motive as the mission work: "The love of Christ constraineth me."

Radio

CWM heard a progress report on the LWF radio project, indicating good prospects of being granted a franchise to establish the radio station in Ethiopia. The project has during the past year, since its conception at Sigtuna, met with encouraging response from Lutheran churches and missions on both sides of the Atlantic. A statement of purpose and policy for the station was unanimously approved, as was a proposal for co-operation with a non-Lutheran radio-interested group.

The agenda offered, as usual, a heavy burden of administrative details which might still raise some doubts in the minds of some whether CWM is in fact approaching the status of a super mission society, despite the denials made last year. Whatever the tendency is, the policy of CWM is well defended by the care and thoroughness with which all the different needs are considered and met.

Nevertheless, in the last session delegates could not help being worried, when a deficit budget was proposed. There were some alleviations offered through reference to a possible increase in income, but it remained a challenge to the faith of all the members. The work is increasing and so are its demands on our wholehearted efforts.

CARL GUSTAV DIEHL

The Mission of the Church

Note

Because of wide-spread misunderstanding of the church's mission to the world, especially as that is expressed in "foreign" or "world" missions, the Commission on World Mission prepared and authorized publication of the following statement. It attempts in very brief form to set forth the basic principles that guide the modern church in its proclamation of the gospel to the world.

1. The mission of the Church is the task given through the mandate of Jesus Christ and inherent in the nature of the Gospel itself: to proclaim among all peoples and nations the Gospel of God, the Creator and Preserver of the world, of Jesus Christ, the Savior, Redeemer and Lord, and of the Holy Spirit Who enlightens the hearts and minds of men and calls them to faith; and to teach them to observe all that Christ commanded.

The missionary mandate implies an exclusive allegiance to Christ and His command. The Church, therefore, has no secondary purposes in the conduct of its mission, such as the spread of any particular civilization or culture.

2. The mission of the Church is concerned with both the near and the distant, with people at home and abroad.

Christians will find ample scope for their missionary endeavors within the nations and societies of which they are a part. But this responsibility at home does not release them from their responsibility to other peoples and nations. These two responsibilities—to those at home and to those in distant lands—cannot be separated from each other.

3. The mission of the Church is guided and directed solely by the Word and Will of God as manifested in Holy Scriptures.

God has spoken through the revelation of His Word and His Will;—therefore, the Church cannot be silent, but must proclaim this salutary truth before all the world. God bore witness to the truth by sending His Son Who is the eternal truth;—therefore, the Church must witness to what is true before all nations, authorities and peoples. Listening to the Word of God, the missionary Church will avoid giving primary allegiance to changing human doctrines and devices, and will be kept from bondage to current philosophical and political ideas. It will be constantly aware that God's purpose in His mission is to seek and to save those who are lost.

4. The mission of the Church addresses itself to man in his totality, ministering to both spiritual and physical needs.

God, in Christ, Who died for the whole world, has made Himself a servant to all;—therefore, the Church is called to give unconditional service to mankind in all his needs. This missionary service will have many aspects, but these are all derived from and dependent on the central task, which is to proclaim the Gospel.

5. The mission of the Church bears witness to the universality of the Gospel, which is relevant for all peoples and nations.

Since all men have been created in God's image, and since God's salvation is offered to every human being, the Church, in her missionary work bridges the divisions of class, race and people, and resists all trends based on supposed superiorities of races, nations, cultures and societies. To the Christian all differences are modified and made meaningful by the fact that all people are one in Christ.

6. The mission of the Church is an essential function of the life of the Christian community.

The life and strength of the congregation become evident in its missionary service to the world. The Church cannot exist without mission, since mission is a witnessing act of the Church, regardless of the organizational framework in which this act is undertaken. The strength of the Church is commensurate with the degree to which its members are the salt of the earth and the light of the world.

7. The mission of the Church is the common task of the Christians of all races and in all

parts of the world, and is directed to the whole world.

There was a time when missionary work in foreign lands was done only by the churches of Europe and America. Today African and Asian churches are to an increasing degree offering fraternal assistance to the churches of Europe and America as well as carrying on missionary work in the non-occidental world. These activities promote the growth of ecumenical fellowship, mutual understanding and international good will in all parts of the world.

8. The mission of the Church of Jesus Christ will continue until the end of the world.

Although the mission of the Church in all of history has been influenced by theological and secular currents of thought, and served by erring men, it is the mission of God. All the past and present errors cannot destroy the purpose which God is pursuing in this work: the preparation of His eternal Kingdom. God requires of the Church not only that it be sensitive to the age in which it lives, but also that it be completely dependent on the Holy Spirit by Whose power and guidance it is alone possible rightly to carry out Christ's command. Thus, the Church, living by the forgiveness of its Lord, will be sustained by His Word, and will remain faithful to its mission until the end of time.

Refugee Problems

The Year of the Uprooted

A FORMAL TREATISE on "the refugee problem" should probably begin with an attempt to define the term "refugee." In this case, however, few efforts could be more fruitless. A number of definitions have been formulated, but they have been technical, legal, diplomatic or political definitions. They have served to exclude some, rather than to include all. To understand the refugee problem we need, not cold definitions, but a warm, penetrating concern for human welfare—or, to put it more forcefully, concern over human misery.

Refugees, we might say, are people whom force, fear or desperation has uprooted from their homes and homelands and driven them to a haven in a strange land, where usually they find themselves resourceless, unsettled and unwanted. Ranging them in accordance with the circumstances that attended their movement across frontiers, you have expellees, displaced persons, political escapees, economic refugees, illegal emigrants, and finally legal emigrants, which of course take us out beyond the field of refugees. Such a thing as "illegal emigrants" exists, obviously, because not all governments accept emigration as a fundamental human right, to be facilitated to all their subjects (except escaping criminals) who desire it. For this reason mainly, would-be emigrants become refugees—people without passports and other essential legal papers. And by becoming refugees, they become "legally non-existent, a phantom rather than a reality."¹

We look upon "the refugee problem" as a mid-20th century development. Yet, in one sense or another of the word, there have probably always been refugees, since the dawn of human history. The ancient Hebrews, after living in Egypt for several generations, left that country against the Pharaoh's will to free themselves from his oppression; they had to make a long, slow journey through barren wilderness and wrest their new homeland from its previous occupants before they could resettle as a free people. Centuries later, the Jews were uprooted by new masters, the Babylonians, and sent to "a strange land" where they found it hard to "sing the Lord's song." More centuries passed, and when Christ was born, the holy family had to flee by night to distant Egypt to save the tiny babe from being murdered by a jealous king.

Numerous other examples could be cited of "refugee experiences" in nearly every page of human history, down to our times. Military conquests, revolutions, harsh civil rule, religious and racial strife and persecution and, once in a while, natural calamities—all have driven people from their homes and homelands. With the passage of the years, these people have all been swallowed up—some by destitution, despair and death,

others in a different way, by self-rehabilitation and some degree of absorption in the new society into which they were thrust.

"The Century of the Uprooted"

It took the 20th century, however, to challenge man to apply his conscience, his mental powers and his resources to the alleviation and attempted solution of "the refugee situation" as one of the world's major social problems. A number of factors combined to render human beings homeless in hordes never before known in history. The population of the world began to "explode," increasing the pressure for "living room" in numerous areas of the globe. Passionate modern nationalisms and political ideologies and demagogues rose up and seized by force, first their homeland peoples, then foreign peoples over vast areas of the earth. Racial and religious hatreds were fanned. At the same time, influenced by the spread of the modern democratic concept of basic human rights, less and less of the world's peoples were willing to stay rooted to their ancestral land if it meant meek submission to oppressive rule. More and more were ready to flee to a land that was strange, but free.

So the 20th century became "the century of the uprooted." By 1917 already five million had been forced to leave their homes in Europe and the Near East. Between then and 1933, the Bolshevik Revolution made another two million refugees, and 6.5 million were uprooted through post-war treaties. From 1933 to 1945, the additional number of political escapees, war refugees, deportees and expellees reached the staggering totals of 48.2 million in Europe and 31 million in Asia. The immediate post-war years 1945-47 deserve to remain forever infamous for their contribution of another 56.8 million Germans, Poles, Russians, Hungarians, East Indians, Pakistanis, Koreans, Vietnamese, Chinese, Arabs, Near East Jews, and Bulgarians to the tragic roll of the uprooted.² This is to say nothing of the 150 million who were killed by the same inhuman measures during the past four decades.

On the bright side of the picture, we can recall the valiant effort made by the Christian churches of countries not left desolate by the

¹ This expression was used by Msgr. Joseph J. Harnett in an interesting discussion of "A refugee without identity papers" during an address at the 9th International Conference of Social Work in Tokyo. Printed in *Migration News*, May/June 1959 (VIII:3), pp. 7-8.

² *World Veteran*, March 1959, p. 18

war, to alleviate the misery of the homeless millions and to help them rehabilitate themselves, especially through resettlement in lands receptive to immigration. Space does not permit us to recount that story here; besides, it is already well known to many of the readers of this periodical. Suffice it to remember the specific development of a strong international Lutheran program in this field, called forth by the fact that Lutherans were the religious group most deeply affected by the European cataclysm, aside from the Roman Catholics. This Lutheran program of refugee relief and resettlement, in fact, was one of the post-war ingredients that combined to produce the Lutheran World Federation.³

Some governments, too, did their part to help the refugees, directly and through the several post-war international agencies set up for that purpose. Conspicuous among them was the United States, which besides substantial monetary contributions opened its doors between 1946 and 1959 to displaced persons, ethnic Germans, escapees and other refugees whose total number has been variously calculated at between 400,000 and 689,000. In the entire world, about four million of the post-war refugees have been permanently resettled somewhere—what a tiny fraction of the whole number of the uprooted!

Nations Working Together

A few words should be said about the chief intergovernmental agencies that have been wrestling with this enormous human problem in recent years.⁴

The office of the *United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees* (UNHCR) was set up to provide legal protection to uprooted people—now numbering over 1.5 million—who are characterized as *de facto* or *de jure* stateless refugees. His mandate does not include the Palestinian Arab refugees who are looked after by another United Nations agency (UNRWA, see below), nor the Germans, East Indians, Pakistanis, North Koreans and North Vietnamese which are recognized as nationals by the countries to

which they have gone. The High Commissioner's present main tasks are clearance of refugee camps in Europe, resettlement of European refugees now on the Chinese mainland, permanent settlement of ethnic Greeks, assistance to handicapped "out of camp" refugees in Europe, emergency aid to refugees in Tunisia and Morocco, and promotion of projects to benefit Chinese refugees in Hong Kong.

The *United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East* (UNRWA) is a temporary, non-political body specially established by General Assembly action to provide food, medical care, education and shelter to about a million Arabs who were uprooted when the State of Israel was formed, and who now live in an unsettled state in Jordan, Lebanon, the Gaza strip, and the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic. Its present mandate expires on June 30, 1960, and the 1959 General Assembly inherited the responsibility of deciding what to do for these Arab refugees while the pivotal Palestine problem remains unsolved.

The *Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration* (ICEM) was founded at an international conference in Brussels in 1951, and it now has 28 member nations. Its basic activities are, according to its constitution, "the transport of migrants for whom existing facilities are inadequate and who could not otherwise be moved, from European countries having surplus population to countries overseas which offer opportunities for orderly immigration," and "the promotion of an increase of the volume of migration from Europe by providing... services in the processing, reception, first placement and settlement of migrants which other international organizations are not in a position to supply."

Other intergovernmental agencies, such as the *United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency* (UNRRA) and the *International Refugee Organization* (IRO), have now ceased to function and it is unnecessary to recount here the work they formerly performed.

Why Not a Special Year?

Despite all that the churches, the secular voluntary agencies, the governments, and the intergovernmental organizations have done to help the refugees in the past decade and a half, some conscientious individuals strongly

³ Those to whom this story is not well known can read it in Richard W. Solberg, *As Between Brothers* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1957).

⁴ See also *The World Refugee Year*, publication No. M/WRY/10/1959 of United Nations Office of Public Information (19 pp.).

felt that it was far from sufficient. They were convinced that the plight of the refugees ought to be presented more fully and more challengingly to all their fellow men who were privileged to enjoy freedom, a home, a means of livelihood, a citizenship, and other things that are denied to the world's uprooted millions. One of these was Msgr. Edward E. Swanstrom, executive director of Catholic Relief Services—National Catholic Welfare Conference, an American agency. Msgr. Swanstrom remarked at the 1957 International Catholic Migration Commission congress in Assisi, Italy, that, following the precedent of the International Geophysical Year, an International Population Year should be organized to focus people's attention around the world on the urgency of problems in this area.

Soon afterward, three Englishmen, reporters for mass media who admittedly were too young to have had a first-hand experience of the suffering connected with wartime, became obsessed with a similar idea. In the Spring 1958 issue of *Crossbow*, a quarterly British journal of politics, they called for a "year" in which the world would be made conscious "once again" of the tragic continuing problem of refugees. Their appeal to their government to take the initiative won wide popular support, and that government—along with those of nine other nations—presented a resolution to this effect in the 1958 UN General Assembly. On Dec. 5, 1958, the resolution was adopted by 59 votes in favor, 9 against, and 7 abstentions. It defined the aims of World Refugee Year in these words: "to focus interest on the refugee problem... to encourage additional financial contributions from governments, voluntary agencies and the general public... [and] to encourage additional opportunities for permanent refugee solutions through voluntary repatriation, resettlement or integration, on a purely humanitarian basis..."

In its resolution, the UN General Assembly requested Secretary General Hammarskjöld to "take such steps as he may think fit to assist in the promotion of a World Refugee Year." Accordingly, Mr. Hammarskjöld set up a small WRY office for information exchange, promotion and coordination at the United Nations European headquarters in Geneva's *Palais des Nations*. As his special representative to head this office he sent Mr. Claude de Kémoularia, a member of his executive office staff. The office stresses that

"the United Nations will help national efforts, [but] it will not in any sense 'run' the Year nor will a new superstructure of international organization or a new central fund be established." Working with Mr. de Kémoularia in Geneva are staff members of other UN agencies: the UNHCR, UNRWA, and the Office of Public Information.

Considering the short space of time it had to become known and appreciated in different circles, World Refugee Year has been accorded a wide favorable response. Such widely known figures as Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan and the well-known personalities Yul Brynner, Ingrid Bergman and Larry Adler have agreed to lend their services to the UN for promotion of WRY in the coming months. On the other hand, Pope John XXIII broadcast a message on June 28, the Sunday before the year opened, stating that "We whole-heartedly give the moral support of Our encouragement to this noble undertaking." Citing the words of Christ in Matthew 25:35-36,⁵ he said: "We paternally exhort all Our children in every part of the world to collaborate generously and efficaciously in making a success of this World Refugee Year." The Pope promised that "We Ourselves" will "hasten the fulfilment of so desirable an end by participating... according to our means." He also expressed the wish "that... States... might throw open their frontiers ever more generously and speedily bring about the human and social resettlement of so many unfortunate people."

59 Countries, 69 Agencies

Not only did 59 countries, through their governments, vote to have a World Refugee Year; the same number have signified their intention to participate actively in it. Of these, 35 to date have set up, in accordance with the suggested pattern, national committees for the observance. In many of these national committees, even where Lutherans constitute a small minority, their refugee experts have been accorded key places, in recognition of the outstanding role that world Lutheranism has played in post-war refugee services. The Canadian committee is headed by Reuben C. Baetz, former director of the LWF Department of World

⁵ "I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me;... in prison, and ye came unto me."

Service, while the Hong Kong committee is led by Pastor K. L. Stumpf, present LWF/WS senior representative in that Far Eastern British colony. President Eisenhower issued a formal proclamation of WRY in the United States and invited "all our citizens to support generously, either through the voluntary welfare agencies or the U.S. Committee for Refugees, the programs developed in furtherance of that Year for the assistance of refugees." Queen Elizabeth II consented to be the patroness of the British national committee for WRY. King Olav V of Norway and other heads of state did likewise in their respective countries. Space does not permit us to detail the WRY plans and activities of the countries just named, nor of other countries that might especially interest Lutherans: Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, and so forth. However, we urge our readers to familiarize themselves with these plans and activities, as far as their own respective countries are concerned, and to support them in every possible way.

In addition to the UN and the other inter-governmental agencies, and the national efforts by governments and citizens' groups, there has been an important "third force" giving impetus to WRY ever since the idea of such an observance first began to gain attention. This force consists of the international voluntary agencies of which a great number of leading ones—Protestant, Roman Catholic and Jewish, as well as secular, like the Red Cross—have their world or European headquarters in Geneva. Long before World Refugee Year, there already functioned in Geneva a Standing Conference of Voluntary Agencies Working for Refugees, bringing together representatives of the relief and refugee services of such organizations as the World Council of Churches, LWF, YMCA, and (American) National Catholic Welfare Conference.

This conference last March took the initiative to organize in Geneva an *International Committee for World Refugee Year* (ICWRY). By September the committee had enlisted the membership of no less than 69 non-governmental agencies—the largest number ever joined together in a common international effort on behalf of refugees. The stated aims of ICWRY are to "establish close cooperation with national WRY committees... take the initiative in seeking to establish national WRY committees in... countries where no local initiative is evidenced,

develop a promotional and information exchange service... maintain close liaison with the United Nations (Special Representative of the Secretary General for World Refugee Year, UNHCR and UNRWA), intergovernmental organizations... and governmental agencies... [and] assure that refugee groups who might have been overlooked, should have their plight brought to public attention and concern." Chairman of ICWRY's executive committee is Dr. Elfan Rees, refugee affairs adviser of the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs (a joint agency of the WCC and the International Missionary Council), while its treasurer is Donald E. Anderson, secretary for resettlement and material relief of the LWF.

What Some of Us Are Doing

Many of the agencies which joined ICWRY did so to express their support for the cause to which it was dedicated, but they were not themselves "operational" in refugee work. Some of the others, however, have had their own programs in this field for a number of years. The League of Red Cross Societies, with the support of 55 of its affiliates, is now bringing relief to about 200,000 Algerian refugees in Tunisia and Morocco. It is doing so at the request of the UN, just as it did earlier for the Arab refugees in the Near East and the Hungarian refugees. The World Alliance of YMCAs has asked its member associations to make possible this year a \$500,000 international refugee service program. Among those currently being helped by the YMCAs are the 20,000 Tibetan refugees in India. The WCC has called on its constituency to underwrite a long list of special WRY projects, at a total cost of over six million dollars, in addition to its regular refugee program.

The special World Refugee Year program of the LWF includes projects in four major refugee areas of the world: western Europe, Hong Kong, India, and the Near East. For this program, the Lutheran churches of the world are asked to give a total of one million dollars. The following undertakings are contemplated: (1) grants for housing and house furnishing, and supplementary welfare assistance, to make possible permanent local resettlement of "forgotten refugees" in Austria; (2) housing assistance and welfare grants for out-of-camp non-German refugees in Germany, and aid to exile churches working with such refugees; (3) medical and health

services, self-help projects, vocational training, child welfare, educational assistance, and material goods for Chinese refugees in Hong Kong, for displaced Hindus who fled from Pakistan following partition and who are now concentrated in northeastern India, and for Arab refugees in Jordan. The approximate allotment of funds—subject to adjustment—is \$150,000 each for Austria and Germany, \$250,000 each for Hong Kong and Jordan, and \$200,000 for India.

In announcing the federation's program for WRY, Director Bengt Hoffman of the Department of World Service said: "These projects... deal mainly with assistance for integration and rehabilitation. In many ways, this aspect of our refugee program is the most costly, the most difficult to accomplish and the 'least attractive,' as the results are never spectacular and are always slow in appearing in any statistics or reports. Nevertheless, these projects, if implemented, will make a contribution to refugees which will be lasting, effective and permanent. In terms of the overall problem this is only a small effort,⁶ but in terms of the individual lives which they will affect, they will be a contribution of major significance and importance."

The LWF Executive Committee, at its annual meeting in Strasbourg, France, in October 1958, declared that it was deeply interested in the proposal for a World Refugee Year and pledged "its support and continued cooperation in a joint international effort to relieve the plight of homeless people throughout the world." At the same time, the committee called the LWF member churches to prayer, urging them that "as we think of the millions of refugees and oppressed, the hungry and homeless in many parts of the world, our prayers to God should be that He not permit the powers of evil to prevail but that His good and gracious will may be accomplished." The WCC Executive Committee likewise adopted a resolution of endorsement, and this was sent out with a message signed by the council's five presidents, asking member churches to pray for the year's success.

Are Solutions in Sight?

Lest any entertain false hopes as to what World Refugee Year is supposed to achieve,

its organizers and promoters, in the words of Dr. Hoffman, "are very careful to point out that it is not possible to solve all the problems of refugees in one year." Yet, as a UN pamphlet has affirmed, "a great deal can be done to alleviate human distress and to start positive approaches to the basic issues involved."⁷ What, really, are the "solutions to the refugee problem," and what hinders their being put into effect? Basically, there are three main "solutions," and they can be stated very simply: repatriation, integration in the country of first asylum, or resettlement in some hospitable country. In fact, however, there are many obstacles to the application of any of these.

(1) *Repatriation* is something that most refugees do not want. To be returned to the scene from which they fled would not "solve" their big life problem. There is, of course, such a thing as involuntary repatriation. New refugees are sent back from West Germany to the East Zone, and from Austria to Yugoslavia, if they are adjudged to have crossed the border for the sake of economic betterment rather than escape from persecution. But such repatriation is open to criticism, and the United Nations WRY resolution speaks only of *voluntary* repatriation among the possible solutions to refugee problems. Among the major refugee groups now extant, the conspicuous one clamoring for repatriation is that of the Near East Arabs. For them and their fellow Arabs, it is an emotionally charged political argument that no other solution would be "just." However, the new Israel that has been formed in their old homeland is not prepared to receive back more than a very few of them.

(2) *Integration*, to a disinterested outsider, would seem to be a good solution for most Palestine refugees. In the Arab Middle East, there are large underpopulated areas conducive to productive settlement. But, as has just been noted, this "solution" is rejected by the Arabs themselves. In any case, it would throw a very heavy burden on the meager health, welfare and educational facilities of the Arab nations, especially Jordan. This latter difficulty applies also to the Hong Kong refugees; besides, the colony's usable 62 square miles allow no room for so many newcomers, and very few resources or opportunities are afforded these people to support themselves. Yet no other solution seems possible for

⁶ There are estimated still to be 80,000 refugees in Austria, 225,000 (non-Germans) in West Germany, 700,000 in Hong Kong, 4,000,000 in India, and 800,000 in Jordan.

⁷ *The World Refugee Year* (op. cit.), p. 17

most of the Chinese refugees. In European countries like West Germany and Austria, acute shortages of suitable employment and especially housing hinder integration solutions such as camp clearance. These countries, so recently laid waste by war, have simply absorbed all the refugees their conditions permitted, starting with the millions of ethnic Germans driven out of the eastern lands. For the rest, their only real hope is resettlement elsewhere.

(3) *Resettlement* in western or northern Europe, the Americas or Australia has proven a feasible solution for many European refugees. Unfortunately, such a possibility is not even talked about for Algerians—Arabs—East Indians—Tibetans—Chinese—or Koreans. But even in the case of Europeans, resettlement is only for the sound of body and mind, usually. Countries will permit refugees to migrate to their shores only if assured that they will not be a burden on public health and welfare services. Those physically handicapped, afflicted with tuberculosis, or mentally ill, for example, are automatically left behind, to form a hard core residue in the country of first asylum. This is a manifest injustice against the country of first asylum, as well as an act of inhumanity against the refugees themselves. The argument of the immigration countries is that they have to protect themselves economically—after all, it costs the country enough just to take care of healthy refugees.

Not a Liability but an Asset

This common belief that all refugees are economic liabilities to their adopted homelands is quite unfounded. Refugee files overflow with case records of thousands of families which clearly prove the opposite—that given a decent chance for integration in the new society, refugees are a definite economic asset to their country of resettlement. Nearly two million people—including large numbers of refugees—have emigrated to Canada since the last war. The country's Minister of Citizenship and Immigration has pointed out that in 1957 such immigrants paid about 190 million Canadian dollars in direct taxation and saved some \$146 million.⁸ Or take Australia. Since the war, Australia has undergone a tremendous expansion, both

industrially and agriculturally. This rapid expansion, says a United Nations pamphlet published in 1959, "would not have been possible without the new Australians." It goes on: "It was the new migrants, including very many refugees, who supplied her [Australia] with the essential margin of productive resources that has started her on the path to becoming a great nation."⁹ A Roman Catholic booklet published in that country recently says: "To the thousands who have come to our shores, the opportunity for a new life has been offered. In many ways, however, the migrants have given far more than they have received."¹⁰

Actually, the nations of the world have to spend much more on the care and support of refugees because in most cases¹¹ they fail to provide prompt resettlement opportunities for them as soon as they cross over to the country of first asylum. This failure to immediately disperse the refugees over a wide area where housing and job opportunities are available to them may mean a smaller initial expenditure, but in the long run it proves far more costly and results in far more hard core, impossible-to-resettle cases.

Yes, "the refugee problem" will still be with us when World Refugee Year is over. There will still be millions of homeless, destitute, discouraged men and women, boys and girls. But God will have mercy upon us if we have not been like the priest and the Levite who "passed by on the other side."

WILLIAM A. DUDDE

Christian Literature

The Areas of Cooperation Possible between Lutheran Publishing Houses

BEFORE OUTLINING the possible areas of cooperation might we take a few minutes to think about the reasons for closer collaboration between the publishing interests of those churches affiliated with the Lutheran World Federation.

⁸ *New Citizens Are New Assets*, published by United Nations World Refugee Year secretariat, Geneva, p. 4.

¹⁰ *Land Without People*, published with the authority of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church in Australia.

¹¹ A notable exception was the quick opening of immigration doors to those who fled from Hungary after the 1956 uprising was put down.

⁸ The Hon. Ellen Fairclough in an address to the Montreal chapter of the American Marketing Association and the Sales Executives' Club of Montreal

The first reason arises from the spirit of the times in which we live. In these days of a world grown smaller because of rapid transportation and rapid communications, the literate world is informed in a matter of hours of political and economic events occurring in nations all over the world. It is predicted in the public press in the United States that very shortly television will bring into the homes of those fortunate enough to have television receivers, actual events as they occur in Europe, and similarly people in Europe will receive telecasts of events in North America. The simple fact is that while the public press and television supply information about current events, they rarely are vehicles for transmitting from one country to another the profound thoughts of scholars concerning things of the spirit. Communication of these is left to books. This is as it should be. If we are at all concerned about the Lutheran church maintaining a world-wide confessional witness, and strengthening the fraternal bonds of Lutheranism, publishers must seek to improve the rapidity with which significant books get world-wide circulation.

As another reason we need only to reflect on the fact that historically the printing press has been one of the regular means used by the Lutheran church to communicate thought. The rapid spread of the Reformation was aided materially by the printer-publishers on the continent of Europe who seized eagerly on the writings of Luther and his contemporaries, perhaps not entirely from unselfish motives. Nevertheless they published the good news of an unfettered gospel. If it had not been for the publications of Melchior Lotter the Younger, Johann Rhau and Hans Luft in Germany, Robert Etienne in France, the Royal Press of Stockholm, the University Press under Peter Wald in Finland, Hans Tausen, Christian Pedersen and Pastor Olaf Ulricksoen in Denmark, the task of reforming the church would have been at least delayed. The significant point is that in spite of upheavals in the political world and rudimentary communications, these publishers maintained an interchange of information about new materials.

The third reason is one of which Luther himself speaks. In his "Address to the Councilmen—That they establish and maintain Christian schools" he says "Since, then, God has at present so graciously bestowed upon us an abundance of arts, scholars, and books,

it is time to reap and gather in the best, so far as we are able, and to lay up treasure in order that we may preserve for the future something of these years of jubilee and not lose this bountiful harvest" (Martin Luther II, 97-103). While it is true that these words were pointing to the necessity for adequate libraries for the Christian schools Luther was advocating, this quotation points up an added reason for diligent speed in making current books available in many languages. Those of us who have witnessed the destruction of libraries in the cataclysm of war know too well that a wide dispersal of important theological works may well provide for their transmittal to future generations. In these days it is not safe to assume that ample time is left to provide for translation and publication in other languages.

A fourth reason is that there is a great diversity of gifts among our churches just as there is a diversity in organization and methods. It is natural to expect therefore that the world wide church will profit when the Christian thought forms of the various countries and the churches within their boundaries are speedily communicated to other parts of the church all over the world.

If these were not reasons enough then at least we can be sure that, with cooperation between the Lutheran publishers, authors would be guaranteed a world-wide readership rather than a readership confined at best to those familiar with their own language. This, it would appear, should enable us to pressure some of those who should write books but do not.

Even if you are convinced at this point that Lutheran publishers should cooperate, you are already asking the question—How?

Let it be said at this point that what follows are suggestions only. It is hoped that others may contribute ideas to help answer the question, How?

Let us begin with what would be the easiest step. As book publishers we all plan our program by first enlisting someone of competence to write a book on a given subject. It is rarely that a manuscript is voluntarily submitted which excites us sufficiently to make us want to publish it.

If our respective editorial staffs see that a manuscript is developing which is not purely national in content but of import beyond national borders, then here is the first opportunity to cooperate on international lines.

With proper procedures set up, publishers in other lands can be alerted so that, subject to satisfactory royalty arrangements and copyright protection, translation can be undertaken as soon as the manuscript is completed. While the book undoubtedly will appear in its original language before it appears in translation, it will be brought to the attention of other countries much more rapidly than is now possible. Under present conditions a book may be on the market for a year or more before it is discovered and translation rights negotiated. Sometimes, of course, it is never discovered for translation.

When we survey the total area of Lutheran theological books in print, we can point to fields which are not covered or are inadequately covered. One might think that the prolific pen of Luther had covered every possible subject. We know that this is not true. We also know that with every generation not only Luther but the gospel itself must be reinterpreted in the thought forms of that generation, particularly in the light of an expanding revelation of God's creation. But every country does not have men who are competent to write on every facet of theology. By long range planning as a cooperative effort of the publishers, the most competent men in the world church, regardless of nationality, could be induced to write on a subject in their particular field, particularly if they know in advance that it is the worldwide Lutheran church which will be their audience.

As publishers we are all aware, at least this is true in North America, that there is a great need for books which deal with the verities of Christian faith written authoritatively but in language which does not presume an extensive knowledge of theology. Our professional men, scientists, engineers, yes, and scholars in fields other than theology have questions and are wanting answers. Speaking from the viewpoint of North America, one of the greatest problems confronting the Lutheran church is the assimilation of men and women of culture who want stronger meat than is available in a brief series of lectures on the catechism and the theological positions of the Lutheran church which they receive to prepare them for membership in the Lutheran church. Convinced as we are of the soundness of Lutheran doctrine, we forget that it needs adequate explanation to those who, having left their original faith, whatever it may have been, have entered

the Lutheran church. It would appear that as publishers we should pool our knowledge of authors who can write for this urgent need.

Then there is the burning necessity to give the diaspora and younger churches an opportunity to speak. Where the Lutheran church has relatively small membership, even if there is a subsidized church publishing house, the very paucity of the readers is no great encouragement to indigenous authorship. Yet these churches, many of them combating an overwhelmingly non-Christian population, out of their travail, have in their membership those who have something to contribute. An organized cooperative effort could reach out to encourage potential authors in these churches with the possibility of compensation in the form of royalties.

While we are speaking of the diaspora and younger churches, we should remember that they are now producing books. At the last Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation, publishers sent Lutheran books from twenty-one countries. In addition to material received from Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia, Iceland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, United States of America, Dominion of Canada, Argentina and Australia, it was of the utmost significance that Tanganyika, Madagascar, India, Japan, the Crown Colony of Hong Kong and New Guinea sent samples of their books. It is countries like those last mentioned that need our help to expand their publication of books usable in their countries. The Lutheran church press in some of the primitive countries needs help. In the cultured countries like India and Japan, many of the books that come from our presses would find a market. As a group of Lutheran publishers we could make a unified effort. To point this up the Lutheran Church in Japan has applied for the right to translate a number of the titles published by Muhlenberg Press. In each case, of course, since out of their poverty they can hardly afford royalties, we have to write to the author for permission to grant a license without royalty. As good Lutherans the authors have always replied affirmatively. But if as a group we could agree that we would include in contracts with authors of books an appropriate provision for granting such licenses, the knowledge of this policy would greatly encourage the younger churches to put into their language books needed by them.

There are many more suggestions which might be areas of cooperation among Lutheran publishers, such as the search for promising authors, the building within the church everywhere of the conviction that those who are competent as writers ought to be given the time to write, the exchange of technical information, and not the least, the development of a rapport which will enable us quickly to meet new publishing emergencies as they may confront our beloved church in the years ahead. It has been said before and it bears repetition here, that no structure which man erects is more enduring than a book.

H. TORREY WALKER

World Presbyterian Alliance

18th General Council, Sao Paulo, Brazil, July 27 - August 6, 1959

SAO PAULO, BRAZIL, was the scene in July-August of the largest General Council in the 84-year history of the World Alliance of Reformed Churches (World Presbyterian Alliance). Despite the relative remoteness of the meeting place, upwards of 400 persons flocked to Brazil's bustling metropolis for the sessions, held in conjunction with the 100th anniversary celebration of Presbyterianism in the Latin American country.

The Presbyterian meeting drew widespread attention in this nominally Roman Catholic area, and an impressive demonstration from Brazilian authorities of their concern for religious liberty. Presbyterian banners appeared across the principal avenues of downtown Sao Paulo, and the city generously gave the use of its modernistic exhibition ground, Iberapuera Park, for the actual Council meetings. A gathering in Rio de Janeiro marking the Presbyterian centennial and attended *en masse* by the General Council delegates was addressed by the President of the United States of Brazil.

In an auspicious setting, the Council reached some significant decisions. A totalling of new projects authorized showed the Alliance spending budget to have been approximately doubled, and the Geneva staff stabilized at a more adequate and efficient level. A Department of Finance was established under the chairmanship of Dr. Glen W. Moore of the

United Presbyterian Church in the USA, and a Committee on Information was set up to study ways of making permanent the information work begun in Geneva by the Rev. James E. Andrews.

Of long range importance also was the establishment of a Department of Theology as a permanent part of the Alliance structure. Conceived as a means of undergirding, financing, and expanding the work done over the past two years by the Theological Secretary, the Rev. Lewis S. Mudge, the new Department is headed by the Rev. James I. McCord, President of Princeton Theological Seminary and Chairman of Faith and Order studies in North America. Mr. Mudge remains in his Geneva post as Secretary of the Department. Current projects of this Department will include a continuing study of the question of ordination and the ministry authorized by the 17th General Council in Princeton, with new emphasis on unordained ministries and the impact on Reformed doctrines of ecumenical thinking in this regard. The Department will also expand its theological information service through which study commissions of member churches of the Alliance can be made aware of parallel work relevant to their concerns done in other churches, communions, and ecumenical bodies.

The major new project for the Department of Theology authorized at Sao Paulo will be "a program of critical and constructive studies of the forms of Reformed theology, life, and practice in the light of the theological insights which are developing in connection with ecumenical experience of all kinds, in connection with frontier situations in the life of the church, and in connection with the state of the contemporary world." This program will be an over-all umbrella for a number of connected projects designed to help fulfill the ecumenical responsibility of the Reformed tradition for self-critical appraisal and constructive contribution to ecumenical discussions. Plans are being made to bring a wider circle of Reformed theologians and scholars into these studies, and to seek foundation support for appropriate research and commission meetings. The exact list of study projects to be included in this program is still under consideration.

The Alliance took important steps in its various ecumenical relations. The General Council resoundingly reaffirmed the commitment made by the 17th General Council to

the aims and purposes of the ecumenical movement, and defined it as an Alliance objective to support and enrich ecumenical activities and agencies. In this connection, the Council issued a challenge to other world confessional groups to define their objectives similarly, authorizing the Executive Committee and General Secretary "to seek consultations between appropriate representatives of all confessional groups, looking toward exchange of definition of their respective characters and objectives and an understanding as to how far each shares the ecumenical commitment stated in the preceding paragraph and what steps each confessional group is taking or is prepared to take to make that commitment real in practice." In addition, the Council specifically authorized the continuation of conversations begun in January, 1959, between the Alliance and the International Congregational Council, to consider the witness and mission of these groups "in the light of the Reformed faith held by them in common."

Two new churches were admitted to the membership of the Alliance, the Presbyterian Church in the Republic of Korea (the second largest of the Presbyterian Churches in that country with a membership of 150,000) and the Church of Christ in Thailand (with 20,000 members). This brings the total number of Alliance member churches to 78.

Dr. Ralph W. Lloyd, President of Maryville College, was elected President of the Alliance to succeed Dr. John A. Mackay. Dr. Lloyd is a former Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, USA, and a member of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches. Dr. Lloyd had been chairman of the Committee on Program and Arrangements for the General Council.

An invitation was received by the Council from the German delegation to hold the 19th General Council in Frankfurt-am-Main in 1964. This invitation was received with great satisfaction, and the matter was remitted for consideration by the Executive Committee, which will meet again from August 8 to 13, 1960, in the Auditoire de Calvin in Geneva.

The theme of the 18th General Council was "The Servant Lord and His Servant People" ("*Der Herr ein Knecht, Wir Seine Knechte*"). An unprecedented amount of preparatory study had gone into the selection and elaboration of this theme, including

reports from some 25 study groups in theological faculties in various parts of the world. For a world conference of the composition and character of this one, the theological effort represented in the addresses, panels, and section reports was of high quality. Two addresses on the main theme by Dr. James I. McCord of the USA and Dr. Bryan de Kretser of Ceylon set the stage. Dr. Joseph L. Hromadka of Czechoslovakia spoke on "The Service of Theology"; Dr. James S. Thomson of Canada on "The Service of the Church"; Professor Pierre Burgelin, a layman, of France, on "The Service of the Christian"; and Dr. Benjamin Moraes, of Brazil, on "The Service of the State." The study section on the main theme was led by Professor Paul Lehmann of the USA, and the other study sections, in the above order, by Professor Wilhelm Niesel of Germany, Professor Richard Shaull of Brazil, Mr. Ben D. Cooke of England, and Dr. Eugene C. Blake of the USA.

It is, of course, more difficult to summarize what the General Council did with its theme than to give the forgoing account of the meeting's program and major decisions. If anything is to be said in short compass, it might be observed that three convictions run throughout the section reports, convictions which may indicate what the Council understood its theme to mean. And along with these convictions, there was an evident awareness of the inadequacy of the Reformed churches, theologically and practically, to give full force to them.

1. It was clear that the service of Jesus Christ meant to the delegates that Christ enters in every possible way into the world and into the human condition, and that his body, the church, only exists authentically in the midst of, and in contact with the world. Philippians 2:5-7 was taken with complete seriousness. At the same time, the section reports show an awareness that a truly adequate theology of the "world," and of the body of Christ as the worldly reality of God's power, does not yet exist. It is clearly a task of the Reformed tradition to lend its resources in formulating such an understanding ecumenically.

2. It was widely agreed that our appropriation of the service of Jesus Christ for our redemption in his body does not admit of any but functional distinctions within the church. The servant theme led the Council to a theology of the "laity" in the sense of the

whole people of God, and forced it to consider how far what is being said on this subject in ecumenical circles may conflict with certain established assumptions of Reformed theology. A deep dissatisfaction with the traditional Reformed doctrines of the ministry continued, as in Princeton, to be in evidence. It was moreover made clear that the gulf in theological viewpoint between church leaders with formal theological training and those without it is very deep: that the "laity" in the usual sense do not share a common understanding of the people of God with the "theologians." Here was a point at which the challenge of the servant figure in terms of the whole fabric of church life was seen to be acute.

3. Finally, it was universally affirmed that the servant theme in the Bible must be applied not only to Christ in the days of his flesh, but to the triune God both preexisting and presently reigning. The Servant Lord continues to act in new ways both inside and outside the church. The duty of the church is to reform itself continually so as to be able to respond in its time to what God is doing. This, for very many delegates, is the central meaning of the term "Reformed." Yet the question arose, and implicitly divided the meeting, of how thoroughgoing the reform might have to be. In particular, there was perplexity about the relation of "reform" to the elements of the Reformed tradition. Could a reaffirmation of traditional Reformed beliefs and practices stand for "reform" today, or is more radical surgery needed for this tradition to be true to its central convictions?

LEWIS S. MUDGE

World Council of Churches

The Central Committee Meeting at Rhodes

TO THE OUTSIDE OBSERVER this year's meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches in Rhodes (Greece), from the 19th-27th August, may at first appear to be less important than some of the previous annual meetings of this

agency which directs the work of its 170 member churches. The church and world press, in its intention to report the conclusions or resolutions of this meeting, found itself facing something of a dilemma, since only the—admittedly important and urgent—appeal by the Central Committee to the great powers to suspend the atomic tests, along with the appeal for a peaceful settlement of international tensions, according to the principles of justice and freedom, seemed to be of public interest. For the rest, it was not really so much the task of this Central Committee meeting to form far-reaching resolutions, or to begin new tasks, since the Third World Assembly is very near at hand, for which the proposals and transactions must be finally decided by next year's Central Committee meeting, which will be held in connection with the 50th anniversary of the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference in St. Andrews (Scotland). This is not meant to imply that the Rhodes meeting deserves less attention than its forerunners. On the contrary, not only did the consultations at Rhodes produce necessary clarifications in respect to future plans such as, above all, the integration of the WCC with the IMC, but the lines of future activity were also considered and set out. So one should not underestimate the significance of this Central Committee meeting—even though it limited itself mainly to the inner problems of the WCC.

Relationship with the Orthodox Church

Of no little importance was the contact with the Orthodox world which the choice of conference-site made possible for the Central Committee. The atmosphere and tone of the conference was set by the Orthodox churches in a manner never before experienced at meetings of the WCC; the Orthodox participants proved not only to be very generous and genial hosts, but because of their positive contributions as well as their critical questions and thoughts, they also took a more active part in the discussions than ever before. Certainly this was in keeping with the intention of the Central Committee, which, for that very reason, changes its conference-site each year in order to keep in close contact with its member churches, both by giving them a clear impression of the ways and work of the WCC and by receiving stimulation and help for its own

plans. This objective was emphasized by the two theological lectures which opened the conference: the highly consequential speech by Prof. Edmund Schlöcker (Heidelberg), showing many new ways of reaching theological and ecclesiastical agreement in the encounter between East and West "The meaning of Eastern and Western traditions for Christendom," and the complementary speech by Prof. C. Konstantinidis (Halki), in which he claimed a revival of traditional Protestantism made such a possibility less obvious. It is to be regretted that pressure of time limited the use which the Central Committee could make of these introductory theological lectures; even though they had to be discussed with unavoidable brevity, the debt of gratitude for their stimulation is in no way diminished. This practice should not only be retained, but it should be more intensively developed by careful planning both before and after the sessions.

Integration

From the practical angle, it was extremely important and advantageous that this year's Central Committee was invited by the Orthodox Church to hold its meetings in Rhodes. The negotiations concerning the integration of the WCC with the IMC have reached a very decisive stage, pointing towards the final conclusion of the plan which is due to be proposed by the next World Assembly. Even though only 46 of the 170 member-churches had made reply by the time of this Central Committee meeting, according to reports, it seems that nearly all member churches are in agreement. The response of the member councils in the IMC is not quite as favorable. Of the 38 missionary councils, 22 have replied in favor and 3 against the merger up till now. The missionary council of the Belgian Congo has left the IMC, while the press releases of the Norwegian Missionary Council show that it is also considering severing its connection. The arguments against the integration of these two large world organizations are familiar: on the one hand is the objection of the fundamentalist-oriented groups in mission work, who feel that their principles will not be sufficiently preserved in such a merger, and on the other hand—and this was subject to debate in Rhodes—are the objections raised from the Orthodox side. The Orthodox speakers did not hesitate to point out, as they had done

at the last two Central Committee sittings, the danger that the WCC might lose its character as a council of churches, were it to merge with such complex mission societies which are not sufficiently integrated with a church as for example, the United Sudan Mission. Is the WCC, which in its present form is not sufficiently understood by, nor is firmly rooted in, the churches and congregations, not in danger of becoming a shapeless "mammoth organization," whose "pan-Protestant" character will make the further cooperation of the Orthodox churches very difficult? Should one not also think of the possible negative effect this might have on the relationship with the Moscow Patriarchate, a relationship which is now just in its infancy? Indeed, would the integration not foster the kind of proselytism among member churches which is feared by the Orthodox churches, if the work of the missions should take over such a central position in the future structure of the WCC? These were questions which were raised again and again, questions for which the advocates of integration sought to give theological and factual answers—not without a certain success—and here the Anglican delegation sought to play a mediating role. On the whole the attitude of the Orthodox delegation is aimed at a temporary postponement of the plan for integration for the purpose of more thorough discussion, rather than a complete rejection of it, which is not to say that the missionary function of the church is denied here. That this is in no way the case was clearly evidenced by the conciliatory speech contributed to the discussion by the Russian Orthodox Bishop John of San Francisco at the close of the conference. Even though one should not be too quick to assume from this very important, but purely personal, speech, which even went so far as to hint at a possible withdrawal from the WCC, that the Orthodox delegation will eventually come to terms with the integration—yet there is evidence of a certain loosening of the solid front, which leads one to hope that a favorable development of plans for integration need not inevitably lead to a break with the Orthodox churches. The painstaking work of the subcommittee, set up during the committee meeting to study the plan for integration, contributed greatly to better understanding by suggesting corrections in terminology which helped to clarify the misunderstandings which arose in the translation from English into

Greek. Provision has also been made for the WCC to issue an authorized translation of the integration plan in Greek.

Relationships with the Moscow Patriarchate

While the plan for integration led to a degree of tension with the Greek Orthodox member churches within the WCC, the relations begun in Utrecht in August of last year between the WCC and the Russian Orthodox Church made further progress. For the first time two representatives of the Moscow Patriarchate, who had previously paid a lengthy visit to the WCC headquarters in Geneva, were official visitors at the Central Committee meeting. They brought a very friendly word of greeting from Metropolitan Nikolai, the head of the foreign office of the Moscow Patriarchate, which relayed not only understanding, but also sympathy for, and interest in, the goals of the WCC. In addition, a delegation from the WCC, under the leadership of the General Secretary, Dr. Visser 't Hooft, has been invited to visit Russia in December. Certainly, the membership of the Russian Orthodox Church in the WCC is still a long way off, but in view of the great gulf of past years, the bridge of ecumenical cooperation now being built between Geneva and Moscow is an encouraging sign for the future of the ecumenical movement.

Rome and the Orthodox Church

It is no secret that the Roman Catholic Church has been following the ever-growing consolidation of the WCC and particularly its relationships with the Russian Orthodox Church with great interest, particularly since the crisis over the integration seemed to offer renewed opportunity to intensify conversations between Rome and the Orthodox churches, especially in connection with the ecumenical council called by Pope John XXIII. This background explains the Roman Catholic interest in the Central Committee meeting at Rhodes. Last year at Nyborg only one Roman Catholic observer was present, this year in Rhodes there were five, although only two—the French Dominican P. Dumont, leader of the Istina-group, which strives especially to improve relationships with the Orthodox churches, and Prof. Willebrants

(Holland), director of the Catholic study-group for ecumenical matters—were accredited by the General Secretary of the WCC. The fact that, in the course of the sessions, a discussion between the Orthodox participants in the conference and the Roman Catholic observers was arranged, at which Father Dumont advocated the extension of Orthodox-Roman Catholic relationships, was in itself nothing unusual. Such conferences, and especially outside the realm of the WCC, have for a long time been customary procedure in inter-church exchange. However, since the conference leaders were not informed about this meeting and the press was given misleading information, this discussion was viewed with suspicion. The Orthodox delegates immediately issued a statement, emphasizing the purely theological nature of the talks, and even Cardinal Tisserant felt it necessary to make an explanation from Rome, stating that Father Dumont had not been authorized to conduct any negotiations. Later official statements, issued by the Roman Catholic Church, announced a plan for a proposed theological conference with the Orthodox churches in Venice in 1960, whereupon Archbishop Jakobos, who was elected one of the presidents of the WCC at Rhodes as successor to the late Archbishop Michael, replied on behalf of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople that the Orthodox churches had given no thought to attending this conference. Only within the realm of the WCC or with its approval would they be prepared to participate in such inter-confessional conversations.

The Ecumenical Council

Judging from the varied and often contradictory reactions in Roman Catholic circles, one can for the moment assume that there is as yet no official Catholic position in relation to the WCC. The problem has particularly arisen in regard to the "ecumenical council" planned for 1961. The Central Committee did not feel it necessary to take any official position with regard to this council, since by the nature of the previous announcements it is officially an inner affair of the Roman Church. Nevertheless the Central Committee has approved the statement of its Executive Committee declaring its readiness to work more closely together with the Roman Catholic Church in social and international

questions, to strengthen theological conversations and to cooperate with the effort to secure freedom of religion for all men in all lands. It is also self-evident that the WCC will give respectful attention to all questions and preparations connected with the council.

Proselytism, Basis, Faith and Order

In line with the above-mentioned matters, three other points of discussion must be mentioned, which were under debate at Rhodes: the study of proselytism, the revision of the Basis, and the future of Faith and Order. Strangely enough, the study document "Christian Witness, Proselytism, and Freedom of Religion within the WCC," which had been distributed to the member churches in 1956, met with very little response, although the consequences of membership in the WCC for the mutual life of the churches are treated here in a very thorough and practical manner. Last year it even appeared as if this study would get lost amid the larger study project on religious freedom. It is not false to assume, however, that concern for the Orthodox brethren, who had originally given the impetus to this investigation, prompted the renewed recommendation of this study document to the churches, for out of its thought provoking positions may come resolutions which can be laid before the World Assembly in 1961.

The Central Committee also sought some clarification of the still unresolved question of the Basis, despite some doubt already expressed in 1957 whether an amplification was at all necessary, or even advisable at this time, in view of the approaching World Assembly in Asia. While the WCC has defined its Basis till now as "a fellowship of churches who acknowledge Jesus Christ as God and Saviour," the proposed Basis includes reference to the Scriptures (on the request of the Church of Norway) and the trinitarian formula (upon the recommendation of the Orthodox churches). It reads:

"The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which, in accordance with Holy Scripture, confess our Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God who was made man for our salvation, in whom the Father was revealed, and to whom the Holy Spirit bears witness guiding us into all the truth."

The Central Committee has now charged the Commission on Faith and Order with the

responsibility to study this expanded version of the Basis and to define more closely the nature and purpose of the Basis. Both the member churches and the assembly should be fully informed by the Central Committee as to what has been undertaken in this question since 1954 and at the same time assured that the Central Committee has no objections to the new formulation of the Basis.

Much more difficult was the question of the "future of Faith and Order." A document with this title had already been brought to the attention of the delegates at last year's Central Committee meeting. It contained a request to intensify the work of Faith and Order and to strengthen its position within the WCC. Many people, above all the European delegates, have the impression that Faith and Order, in contrast to other departments of the WCC, has been unduly pushed into the background and practical cooperation between the churches has usurped the place of the theological concern for the unity of the church. This is behind the impetus to lift Faith and Order out of its oblivion as a section of the Study department and perhaps even elevate it to the rank of an independent department. Furthermore, Faith and Order should be granted a more active, and particularly in merger negotiations a direct, role. These are proposals which are certainly not accepted without question, even by the friends of Faith and Order themselves. Again, should Faith and Order have an independent existence since the other large world movement for "practical Christianity" (Life and Work) willingly allowed itself to become absorbed in the total realm of the WCC? Wouldn't that look as though Faith and Order alone were concerned with the unity of the church, whereas all the departments of the WCC should have their character determined by this objective? And doesn't it mean a complete deviation from the structure and history of Faith and Order work up till now if, instead of continuing to study the problem of unity as in the past, Faith and Order were to assume an active (even though merely advisory) role in merger negotiations? It was generally conceded that the Faith and Order department is at present understaffed. Nevertheless, there will need to be some more thorough discussions before the commission on Faith and Order becomes a stronger influence in the total structure of the WCC than it has been up till now.

The Next World Assembly

The preparations for the next World Assembly took up a large share of the time at the Rhodes conference, upon which, naturally, all the efforts of both the WCC and its member churches must be concentrated in the relatively short time which remains. Since local political conditions render Ceylon inadvisable as the site for the assembly, as had been planned originally, it was decided to meet in New Delhi, India, from November 18 to December 5, 1961. Visits before or after the World Assembly have been planned, both to strengthen the ties with the Indian churches, and to give the delegates an opportunity to become acquainted with Christian life in India. There is no doubt that a world Christian conference on Indian soil will prove of great significance for the small minority churches in India and elsewhere in Asia, and it is hoped that the congregations themselves will thereby be strengthened. On the other hand, as was stressed in the Rhodes discussion, the WCC must take great care to avoid giving the impression that Christianity is the religion of the western, well-to-do world, even in the arrangement of such details as the housing of the delegates, etc.

It is also obvious that the theme of the conference must be developed in relationship to the spiritual and religious background of the Asiatic countries, although it was rightly stressed at Rhodes that the WCC must speak to *all* churches in the *entire* world at its assembly. The preparation of the theme has already begun on a very broad basis. The commission, which will study the biblical references to the general theme "Christ—the light of the world" under the leadership of Paul Minear, could not meet until November of this year. The draft of their study will then be submitted to various church groups in Asia as well as to the individuals who are concerned with the preparations for the various sections. After their comments have been taken into consideration the revised final draft will be presented to the Central Committee in August, 1960. The three sections of the World Assembly—unity, witness and service—were prepared in August of this year in Spittal (Kärnten) by so-called "mixed commissions," composed of members representing as many phases of the WCC work as possible and representatives of churches from a wide variety of backgrounds.

These temporary drafts of the sections will also be submitted to smaller circles representative of the different churches, in order to receive their comments and criticism before the preparatory commission meets again in August, 1960, in order to draw up the final draft for presentation to the Central Committee. The Rhodes meeting declined to issue a more detailed statement of the section themes, since these formulations should grow out of the preparatory work being done. The task of preparing the congregations for the Assembly will be facilitated by a booklet to be issued in the Fall of 1960 which will contain commentaries on the general and sectional themes, short presentations of the work of the WCC in the fields of unity, witness, and service, plus an introduction to the study materials from the perspective of the individual churches. Comments and critiques arising within the congregations from their use of this preparatory material should be addressed to the delegates of the churches in question, so that they can realistically represent their churches at the assembly. The purpose of these detailed preparatory procedures, which may at first glance seem somewhat cumbersome, is to insure that the next assembly will not be limited to very specialized spheres, as were earlier world conferences, but will be a broad and accurate reflection of the work of the WCC and the life of its member churches. This procedure will facilitate an exchange between the general theme and the sub-theme as well as between the sections themselves, which was lacking at Evanston.

The desire has been expressed that the representation of laymen (and particularly the number of women) be increased in the delegations, in order that the next World Assembly will make a more fruitful impact upon the local congregations of the member churches. It is also strongly advised that delegates be chosen who are not only acquainted with the ecumenical scene, but who will also bear responsibility for further ecumenical work in their home churches. Some concern was aroused in Rhodes by the fact that, since 15 churches have joined the WCC since Evanston, for whom 32 seats at the Assembly are necessary, the delegations of some of the larger churches must be reduced in order to keep within the 600 seat limitation. Those which will be affected are mainly North American churches, which have been particularly active and concerned for the

needs of the WCC, and this, of course, is causing them some unhappiness. Even though no easy solution seems to be in sight for the next World Assembly, the Central Commission must sooner or later find a just solution to this problem of representation at world assemblies. Should representation be determined merely by the statistical membership of a church or should the activity and interest of the members not play a role? And shouldn't one also consider whether and to what degree a church is ecumenically active over and above its nominal membership in the WCC? These are questions and perspectives which were expressed at Rhodes, whose justification cannot be doubted, even though they are extremely difficult to translate into normative rulings. For this conference it is hoped that not all churches will use their full quota of delegates, which will enable a measure of compromise. The proposed way out—establishing an unofficial category of "accredited visitors"—did not appear very promising.

In Conclusion

If this report deals primarily with the internal problems of the WCC, this gives no warrant to assume that the international, social, and charitable problems received less attention. Whether it dealt with problems such as the suspension of atomic tests and disarmament, the easing of world political tension—particularly in Germany over the Berlin question—or whether it concerned itself with the role of the churches in World Refugee Year, or the problem of overpopulation, the Central Committee sought always, in keeping with the heritage of Nathan Söderblom, to let the WCC speak to the world as the "united voice of the Christian conscience."

HANFRIED KRÜGER

"Mass Media" and the Ecumenical Movement

CERTAINLY THE MOST SIGNIFICANT THING about this year's annual session of the Central Committee of the WCC, which met at the end of August on the Greek island of Rhodes, was the opportunity it provided

for conversation with representatives of the Orthodox churches. Another aspect of utmost significance, however, was the fact that here, for the first time, a position was taken with regard to those problems arising from the use of modern "mass media," especially radio and television. Up till now radio and television, as well as the press and films, were mainly regarded by the WCC as a means of relaying information in the narrow sense. Now, however, the full significance of these media in their total effect has been recognized as a task and concern of the church, according to a document unanimously accepted by the Central Committee. In the recommendation it was stressed that this new perspective was primarily the result of the work and initiative of the World Committee for Christian Broadcasting, but it must not be forgotten, that the noteworthy stimulation also came from other sources, such as the extraordinary activity of the American churches, as well as the stimulating work of the younger churches in Asia. In the spring of this year, at their conference in Kuala Lumpur (Malaya), they declared that those who work in and with mass media, that is, who have any contact with radio, television and films, must realize that they bear a share of responsibility for one of the most powerful institutional forces affecting the life of modern society.

It is understandable that the WCC, influenced from many sides, finally felt it necessary to turn its attention to these mass media. This occurred in an attitude of self-criticism, for it was called to the attention of the member-churches that "theologians, church leaders, the church press, Christian broadcasters, all of us, seem not quite to have yet awakened to the immense changes in popular culture that are taking place everywhere because of popular literacy and the 'electronic revolution'." This self-criticism should lead us to adopt a new attitude toward the mass media. The document goes on: "Budgeting, training and marshalling of Christians for lay action within the radio and television industries are in most cases feeble and unrelated to the key role of the media in creating the tone of our new, world-wide popular culture. Many churches are spending money on other projects that spring from the modes of thinking and acting of yesterday, ways of life which are now embedded in the conservative church institutions that try to perpetuate them. Allocation of thought,

time, initiative and money for creative work by true artists in radio and television production is one of the highest priorities for churches that wish to be in touch with a rising generation: for this generation is going to be influenced in its deepest springs of imagination and action by the mass media.

"All the issues briefly indicated in these closing reflections call for swift action by the churches. Popularization, the sense of being where the people are, is often disliked because of the expense involved and the fear of getting 'dirty hands.' The world of the mass media, which has come to stay, demands a presence. If this world of mass-communications sometimes looks unredeemed, perhaps that is our fault."

Such a position would certainly have been much less important had it merely finally recognized that, since radio has been in existence almost 35 years, the churches must also take notice of this fact and draw the consequences, the said consequences being, that one should use these media on the ecumenical level in direct evangelistic service. The above-quoted document of the WCC purposely does not limit itself to such a mere recognition, but—and herein lies its great significance—it defines the whole world of mass media with their enormous influence on the life and thought of modern man as the task and concern of the church. All of those from the side of the church, who up till now have turned their attention only to that section of radio and television programming which goes under the title of "religious broadcasting," can learn something here. Above all, it would be a good opportunity for church leaders to realize that it is neither fair nor proper to view radio and television in a pessimistic manner as negative cultural forces, and yet at the same time to take advantage of the opportunity to use them for "religious" programs. Either one must give the microphone and camera credit, that they at least have the ability—even though it is not often used to its full extent—not only of reaching millions at the same time, but particularly of speaking to them as individuals, or one must uncritically assume that all mass media have the tendency to conform men to a uniform way of thinking and thus to a mass existence. This latter viewpoint would also forbid the use of these media for the transmission of the gospel, which stands in direct opposition to such tendencies to conformism.

Such a viewpoint has, to be sure, practical consequences particularly in those lands where radio and television are public institutions or perhaps even organs of the state and therefore allow considerable supervision over their activities. Nevertheless, it is also significant for those countries in which radio and television are organized as private corporations and where broadcast-time is purchased from the station. Here also the church cannot close its eyes to the total character of the programming, and when judging the special religious programs, must see them in relation to the total scope of broadcasting. This can mean that a church-owned station may decide neither to limit itself to individual evangelistic programs, nor to send out a few of such programs along with commercial broadcasts, but to develop her own total program in which, perhaps, only a certain portion will be of a directly religious nature, with primary emphasis on help for daily living, while other parts are devoted to the dissemination of information and entertainment. Such concepts of programming exist in the non-European world.

One of the most impressive examples of a church-owned station is DYSR in the Philippines. Its director, Henry W. Mack, has described the task of a radio station in the middle of the Asian world in this fashion: "We live in an age in which nationalism is on the move. Countries, which for centuries were held back, want the chance to develop. The people are no longer 'natives' but 'citizens.' They desire all sorts of new machines and luxury goods. They want to own and operate their own industries without conditions and restrictions even though they cannot afford to do so. They are extraordinarily sensitive and can take no criticism. In this boiling cauldron we are trying through our radio to develop a 'voice of Christian brotherhood.'" This "voice of Christian brotherhood," according to the idea of Henry W. Mack, should not only be limited to the direct evangelistic programs which usually come under the heading of "religious broadcasting." Radio stations should rather prove themselves of genuine Christian assistance by taking into consideration the ever-growing desire for learning, and by providing some form of orientation in a world which is becoming more and more complicated. This does not at all mean to minimize the significance and special tasks of those programs or mission stations which have as

their goal the reaching of souls through distinctly evangelistic programs. They are—if only as additions to the other concept of a whole day-broadcasting system—increasing from year to year, and provide a very singular chance to preach the gospel in an environment in which the ancient religions of Islam, Buddhism and Shinto are showing new life, and as such are an integral part of the work of the younger churches in the ecumenical world.

The oldest of these stations is the one in Quito, the capital of Ecuador, just a few miles from the equator: the "Voice of the Andes." It has been operating for over 25 years and is completely supported by freewill gifts under the direction of the World Missionary Radio Fellowship. Other important church-owned stations—in addition to the above-mentioned one in the Philippines—are the various mission stations in Tangier and the HLKY station in Korea. The stations in Tangier are at present facing great difficulties, since Tangier no longer has an international character and hence the Moroccan government has decided to refuse the right of operation to all foreign radio stations in this country. What the fate of these mission stations will be, and what new possibilities will be found for their work, cannot as yet be predicted.¹ In this connection one must mention the great work being done by the Lutheran Hour of the Missouri Synod in the USA, whose programs are among the most widely heard evangelical broadcasts in the world.

A particularly difficult situation in Asia arises because the Indian state radio gives no time for Christian broadcasts. In former years an attempt was made to get around this situation by purchasing time on the commercial stations of Ceylon which beamed Christian programs to India and Pakistan. These contracts expired two years ago and have not been renewed by the radio stations. Finally, after prolonged negotiations, the government radio of Ceylon has made 10 per cent of its total broadcast-time available for religious programs, on a proportional basis to the membership-strength of the various religions of the island. The time allotted to

the Christians is shared equally by the Roman Catholic Church and the National Christian Council, the alliance of Protestant churches. The radio-time in Malaya is also very limited. At any rate the Christian churches still have the opportunity here, since the division of the country, and the subsequent separation of the radio system into Radio Malaya and Singapore Radio, to send Christian programs in the English, Chinese, and Tamil languages over both stations. The opportunities in Burma are more advantageous. The government of the Union of Burma gives Christians the right to produce their own program on the state-owned radio every Sunday night—even if it is only 15 minutes long. Since July, 1958, this is supplemented by programs beamed into the area from the Philippines by the Far East Broadcasting Company, which is the only chance to send Christian programs in the Burmese and Karen languages to Burma. All of these opportunities, which exist in Asia alongside the work of the church-owned radio stations, are coordinated by the Asia Conference on Christian Mass Communication, under the direction of Mathew S. Ogawa in Tokyo, which conducts regular courses for the training of Christian radio workers and which cooperates in the World Committee for Christian Broadcasting.

It is quite obvious that the methods and principles behind Christian radio work differ greatly from one another. It is a different situation, whether this work is carried on in Germany, where 98 per cent of the population belong to the Christian church or at least have nominal membership in the church, or whether, as in the USA, 75 per cent of the population has either some church relationship or at least some form of Christian background, or whether, as in Japan, approximately 99.5 per cent of the population not only is outside of the church but has strong ties to its own living religions—in this case Shinto and Buddhism. Finally, it is also of considerable significance whether the listeners to the Christian radio station live in reach of a Christian church or more than a hundred miles away from one. No less important, in this regard, is this comment by a leading spokesman for Christian radio work in Nigeria: "If the Christian faith is to take hold in a country, it dare not be associated with something foreign." What he meant to express thereby was, that the need for varying types of methods arises not only because of structural principles but also

¹ Under a Moroccan government order, all private radio activity in that country will be banned beginning next Jan. 1. Norea Radio, which is one of several international Protestant broadcasting operations affected by the order, has obtained a licence to air its programs over the planned new Monte Carlo transmitter.

because of the difficulties inherent in the multi-language areas of the Near and Far East, where either more stations must be erected alongside one another to serve in the different languages, or the opportunity for programming a few minutes or hours per day must be provided for each language group.

All of these observations must naturally be taken into consideration in planning for the LWF station in Africa. It will undoubtedly have to limit itself to a few language areas important to missionary work and in the course of time will have to beam more programs in various languages simultaneously. This will be absolutely necessary, if it is decided that the station will not limit itself to the evangelistic-type program, but will offer more hours of information, education, and entertainment to its listeners.

The mere mention of these many-sided difficulties and the very differing situations with which Christian radio work must come to grips throughout the world makes clear how complex the problem is, to which the WCC addressed itself when it not only took notice of the mass media, in a more or less academic manner, but also undertook to give the various churches and Christian institutions and groups practical assistance in carrying out their work more effectively than before. In close connection with the World Committee for Christian Broadcasting, an investigation has been planned, in order to determine what the churches and religious groups are already doing in the area of radio and television and what can still be done to make better use of these media in the service of the Christian gospel. A further consequence of this close cooperation with the World Committee for Christian Broadcasting is that both institutions will hold their world meetings at the same time and place, namely, in New Delhi, India, in 1961.

The meeting of the Central Committee of the WCC took the initiative at Rhodes in its declaration that the mass media of radio and television have a very important and incalculable ecumenical responsibility throughout the world and in its call to all Christians to remain conscious of this fact in their thoughts and actions. This does not mean, however, that now that the initiative has been taken, the issue can be pigeon-holed and handed to some future sub-committee for further academic discussion. Something fruitful will only result if the institutions and

groups in question remain in continual contact with one another and if the WCC serves as a way of giving these conversations a practical orientation. This challenge is in no way unrealistic. Various international conferences of Christian radio and television workers have clearly proved how much the parties concerned can learn from one another, regardless of which countries they work in, or under what conditions. Certainly one cannot take types or general conceptions of programs and apply them without revision to all situations, but the exchange of ideas and experience have been so mutually stimulating that there is no doubt that each can learn from the other and can find something useful for his own work.

A significant contribution to this exchange of experiences is made by *The Christian Broadcaster*, the quarterly journal of the World Committee for Christian Broadcasting, in both English and German. This journal has proved—as have also various conferences and study programs—that especially in this field, the countries with long Christian traditions can learn much from the work of the younger churches in the Near and Far East. This is not only a result of the initiative which the newness of their faith inspires, but results from a missionary situation, where Christian radio and television work finds itself facing a world in which it must be conducted very differently than in those lands with long-standing Christian traditions. Here the initiative of the WCC has a real chance to serve practical Christianity.

H. W. VON MEYENN

Problems of Rapid Social Change

IT WAS ALREADY RECOGNIZED in Evanston in 1954 that the peoples of Asia, Africa and various parts of Latin America have awakened to a new concern for basic human rights and social justice, and are revolting against servile political, economic, social and religious conditions. With these facts, the greatest human problems of our time have been raised, problems whose solutions do not lie in the cold war between political blocks or in one particular economic doctrine. The many-faceted problem of rapid social change in the above-mentioned parts

of the world is in ever-increasing measure a challenge to the churches, that is, if the Christian gospel has anything to say to men whose destiny and position as children of God can be determined by living conditions in the world.

It was to state more clearly the way in which Christians can solve the basic problems of rapid social change that the WCC called together the conference in Thessalonica from July 25 - August 2, 1959, in order to consider the problems and possibilities of Christian action in the face of rapid social change. Theologians and laymen from 35 countries participated in this conference, which represented a milestone in the history of the study project *The common Christian responsibility towards areas of rapid social change*, which had been carried on for several years. Since the results of former discussions and regional conferences as well as individual inquiries were available to the conferees, one could rightly expect some concrete suggestions from this international conference, which could be passed on to the churches and their members.

What is the position of people living in the midst of social and cultural changes? This was the decisive question for the first study-group of the conference, for power and the many-sidedness of the new economic, religious, political and cultural forces have greatly changed the customary limits of man's responsibility and decision. The consequences of these changes go deep to the heart of man's inner life and affect his standards, his customs, and his mental and spiritual outlook. In the light of this situation the study group attempted to formulate clearly the nature of man as defined by the gospel and to refer to practical steps which obedience to God demands of us. Naturally, there are no easy recipes for action. The direct decision of Christians and churches will differ from place to place, but any decisions taken must be seen in the light of the total responsibility of the church, for rapid social change affects more than just isolated functions of the church. This means that a radically new and penetrating restatement of the problems of Christian witness must take place everywhere. The Christian response to rapid social and cultural change dare not be to retreat from the problems it raises. The apostolic, the spiritual, and the prophetic function of the church must gain new life where God is at work among men in the midst of revolutionary social upheaval. A series of proposals for

the realisation of this idea were laid down by the conference, which are currently being revised, but which will soon be made available to the churches.

The second study group of the conference was concerned with Christian responsibility in the field of economic development. There it was made clear that the churches must learn to understand much better than in the past the extraordinary economic changes which are taking place at present, and which are completely changing the lives of men in Asia, Africa and Latin America. It is precisely powerful economic forces which give the impetus to rapid social change in these parts of the world. The desire for a higher standard of living and economic independence, plus a rapid increase in population are the inner driving forces which, intensified by similarly powerful forces from the outside, are exerting great influence on these countries. The study group cited in particular the competition in the world market, the standard of living in the western countries and—closely connected with both—the style of scientific and technical advancement, which help to break down the old conceptions of production and distribution.

In further discussions about the Christian approach to questions of economic development the group reached similar conclusions as they had done with regard to Christian witness, mentioned above. These conclusions are best expressed in the words of the report of the East Asia Christian Conference held in Kuala Lumpur in May of this year: "The church must endeavor to discern how Christ is at work in the revolutions of contemporary Asia.... The church must not only discern Christ in the changing life, but be there in it, responding to him and making his presence and lordship known.... The Asian countries are engaged in a struggle to realize a vast programme of social and economic development. As Christians, we are concerned with that struggle because it is, in several important respects, an expression of man's struggle to give meaning to his life...." Accordingly, the study-group turned its attention to a series of fields in which a Christian concern for economic development must be formulated. Under special consideration were the problems of living standards, the structure of former static societies, the use of natural resources, partnership and stewardship, as well as the spiritual dangers inherent in economic development.

Particular attention was paid to the basic conditions necessary for an effective and responsible economic transition. The right proportion of the factors capital, labor and management was cited as an essential precondition of rapid economic growth and the effective utilization of available natural raw materials. In effecting this proportion the conception of work which people have and their understanding of human relations in industry play a decisive role. Added to this are the readiness to assume new ways of life and the ability to give meaning to these.

Changes call for decisions, they are costly, and can create or destroy values. Since the question of Christian decision has already been stressed above, the costs attendant on economic changes will be briefly mentioned here. They are effected differently in the various spheres of life. The churches must, with understanding, test these costs in relationship to human worth. In that the churches take an open stand and have faith in the economic development of our day, they should promote a spiritual atmosphere in which to undertake critical study and discussion about economic decisions. At the same time the churches must stir the consciences of their members, so that they can make responsible judgments in regard to, and deal understandingly with, economic decisions. Furthermore, the churches should make it completely clear that economic development presents not only a financial concern, but above all a means of realizing man's longing for a better way of life. Naturally, not all the costs and consequences of economic development can be foreseen. Nevertheless, it was the opinion of the conference that every attempt should be made to avoid any unnecessary costs which could be anticipated by careful and extensive planning. In this respect much can be learned from the experience of peoples and countries which have gone through similar transitional stages. However, all human wisdom and experience presents merely a key to further action, never a guarantee of success.

In an attempt to gain a total view of the dilemmas and possibilities involved the group went on to investigate questions dealing with the quality of available leadership, the role of the collective and the individual, the international aspects of economic development and the problem of overpopulation. The conclusion was drawn that an ideal economic development cannot be predicted

in advance. Costs in the form of human need and human suffering cannot be avoided. The Christian must come to grips with these hard facts. He must however work towards establishing reasonable temporary goals, reached through measures which do not exact too heavy a human toll.

The second group studied particularly the changes occurring in rural life and the social and economic aspects of urbanization. In this sphere the group had a number of specific recommendations to make to the church, including some proposals about the establishment of better trade relations and a better distribution of the world's wealth. It was expressly recommended that the churches, even more so than before, should take advantage of every opportunity to share in the work of the various international organizations and work closely with the special organizations of the United Nations—for example, the International Labour Organization and the World Health Organization.

The third study group of the conference dealt, from various perspectives, with Christian responsibility with regard to politics in the lands under development. The group worked from the presupposition that the Christian also has a political responsibility, since politics are the means by which society attempts to reach its goals in many spheres of life. Christians find their warrant for political responsibility in the Holy Scriptures and they must work out its practical application in such a way as to serve the kingdom of God first and foremost. With a view to the relationship between church and state, it was the opinion of the study group that Christians must be conscious of the fact that the traditional state-church in her modern form cannot be transplanted to the lands under development. The church must be free from every form of state control in order to execute her mission independently.

The group studied in detail the attitude of the Christian citizen and the conflicts with which he can become involved. Furthermore, it dealt with basic questions about the political institutions in lands under development, about which the East Asia Christian Conference also had much to say. Particular attention was paid to the problem of dynamic nationalism, which under other aspects had already been discussed in Oxford in 1937.

In conclusion one could say that this conference with its three study-groups, of which the one in which the author participated

has been reported in more detail than the others, pointed out new aspects of Christian responsibility towards the development-lands. The World Council of Churches must therefore be earnestly requested to make this wealth of conclusions accessible to the churches and their members, in order that the fruits of the work carried on till now can

be advanced further, not only in the countries under development but also in the lands with a substantial Christian majority, which are mainly, at the same time, lands with a highly developed economic and technical status.

PETER HEYDE

FROM LANDS AND CHURCHES

Latin America

Minority Churches and Missions

THE RESOLUTIONS and proclamations of large conferences do not always reflect faithfully the inner progress of development and the really essential decisions which are involved. So also justice will not be done the Third Latin-American Conference of the Lutheran World Federation in April, 1959, if it is not realized that in connection with this conference the very thorny problem of the correct approach to "diaspora" and "mission" was raised and very effectively dealt with.

The president of the Synodal Federation, Evangelical Church of Lutheran Confession in Brazil, and the Director of Missions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America, together with the assistance of the Committee on Latin America of the Lutheran World Federation and the Foreign Office of the Evangelical Church in Germany achieved full agreement concerning amicable cooperation in the territory of North Parana in Brazil, in which the Synodal Federation had already been working for decades and in which the Mission Board from North America has decided to begin its own work.

Anyone with a knowledge of church history will take notice here. For these proceedings mean nothing else than that here, in the spirit of brotherly responsibility for the common mission and in full understanding of the various traditions and approaches involved, an attempt will be made to find a way to unity, even though similar procedures have often led to misunderstanding, strife and dissension in the past. More than merely recording this event, let us analyse it in its context and perhaps thereby gain a picture of the inner growth of the Lutheran churches and congregations in South America.

I

First a word must be said about the partners in this agreement. The Evangelical Church of Lutheran Confession in Brazil is that large "Diaspora" church of German background which was formed out of the merger of four synods in south and middle Brazil in 1950. She retains a legal relationship, governed by

a contract which guarantees her independence to her "mother-church," the Evangelical Church of Germany, and is a member of the Lutheran World Federation and the World Council of Churches. With her 600,000 members and 200 pastors she is the largest Lutheran block, and actually the largest Protestant church in all of Latin America. Whoever studies the history of this church cannot cease to be amazed that, despite the many sins of omission of the German evangelical Christendom which left her emigrated members without pastoral services for many decades, and despite the manifold temptations to defection, indifference and idiosyncrasy which the Brazilian situation afforded the immigrant, such a large and living church continued to grow through the mercy and power of God. No little credit is due the strong will of unnumbered individual fathers and mothers who remained true to the faith of their fathers in this their adopted homeland, preserving it for themselves and their children even in the face of oppression when necessary. Added to this is the immeasurable self-sacrificing service of many messengers of the gospel, who as pastors organized the congregations for the preaching of the word and the administration of the sacraments despite the great distances. Finally, of no little importance is the great foresight and daring of those presidents, pastors and laymen in positions of leadership, who continually devoted themselves and their congregations to cooperation wherever possible in order to strengthen the synods in their common responsibilities. This "Synodal Federation" is, perhaps, one of the best examples of a growing "Diaspora" church, stemming from the German *volkskirche* tradition which successfully made the difficult transition from the traditional church structure of the homeland to the system of gathered congregations on the basis of free-will which was necessitated by the new situation. And, finally, one cannot fail to mention the relatively late, yet certainly well-meant, decision of the "mother-church" to stand by these young congregations not only with friendly counsel but also with personnel and financial help.

When one views this church in terms of her mission and her status as a minority church, one must never forget that the large growing church which today meets the eye had to struggle step by step for its very

existence. Naturally, had every emigrant been an enthusiastic messenger for Christ, the situation could have looked different, but these are castles in the air and wishful thinking. In reality, the pastors and leaders of the congregations repeatedly, through tiresome and lonely effort, had to attempt the impossible. They always had to suffer under the fact that despite their best efforts, many of their countrymen still could not be reached. This may perhaps be one of the reasons why the question of the "mission of the church" to those of an entirely different national heritage and of a completely different religious tradition was to a great extent allowed to remain in the background. Without question, this continual necessity "to work beyond the limits of one's strength" in the face of the almost overpowering task of reaching one's own compatriots and fellow-believers had a decisive effect on the churches.

On the other side, we have the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America, a Lutheran church growing out of much similar minority church needs of the Norwegian immigrants to the US, which struggled through to the conviction that a church, if it is to exist at all, must be a missionary church. The president, Dr. F. Schiotz, is known throughout the world as a long-time leader and advocate of Lutheran missionary aid and cooperation. The director of its Mission Department, Dr. Syrdal, views the masses of nominal Christians in this predominantly Roman Catholic environment who have been baptized but never instructed in their faith, as just as much the sacred responsibility of the church as those in North America or anywhere else. The church is called and commanded to be responsible for all people who do not have a living faith in Jesus Christ. Of late, it has become something of a matter of principle for North American mission societies that they not only conduct mission work in their own communities and in the far-away lands of Asia and Africa but also and particularly in South America, which is, so to speak, in their own back-yard.

Other Protestant churches have been doing so for years with varying degrees of success, but with a marked increase in the last few decades. The Lutherans in North America were also concerned with their own problems concerning diaspora and language for too long a time, and not until the end of World War I did they timidly begin to work in

South America. But now they are there and are beginning to work at a number of starting-points with real energy and with clear goals. In choosing an area in which to work some very general considerations must be met: "Where will we reach the people? Where are relatively few missionaries working at present? Where is there a genuine need?" When considering any given area as a possible mission field one must naturally establish contact with the churches and missions which are already on the scene. In this case it was particularly necessary because it involved two churches of the same confession, both of which belong to the LWF.

From a strictly theoretical and objective point of view the problem of reaching an agreement concerning the work already being carried on should be relatively simple to solve. Shouldn't any church be more than happy to receive additional servants of the word, especially when its own resources are insufficient? Couldn't the division of duties be very easily distributed under the motto: "You go to the right and I'll go to the left?" But nowhere are things so simple. Which regional church in Germany would be enthused about an American church setting up a mission program in its area, even, and particularly if the American mission happens to be of the Lutheran confession? Are there not also many nominal Christians among us? Could we allow sister-churches from other lands to come in and take from us the dimension of missions which is a necessary aspect of our existence as a church? These questions introduce us to the precipitous problematic behind these events in Brazil.

II

In a sense this question about the proper relationship between "minority churches" and missions constituted the main theme of the Lutheran conferences in South America although it was not always explicitly stated as such. Through the cooperation in the LWF the relationships between these two very different branches of the work of extending the gospel in the world, are confronted in an attempt to think through their common responsibilities. At the first conference in Curitiba in 1951 there was as yet very little unanimity of opinion. At that time the present president, Dr. Schlieper, gave a noteworthy address on the topic "The Evangelical Witness in Latin America" along with a similar address by

Pastor Arbaugh of Puerto Rico. It was inevitable that the view of the Brazilian pastor, who had received his theological training in Germany, would differ radically from that of the North American, who was in the actual mission field. Both groups at that time knew too little about one another and there was some ground for mutual mistrust. The American ran into the danger of viewing the large German-background Diaspora churches—if I may express it somewhat crassly and in a very pointed manner—as engaged in a struggle for mere survival and therefore nothing more than the dying remains of the German *volkskirche*, kept alive by national loyalty. The German-born Brazilian, on the other hand, feared that the blustering missionary zeal of the North Americans would only be “a bull in a china shop” among the Roman Catholics and would discredit the missionary witness of the Diaspora churches already present.

When viewed realistically, there is no getting around the natural difference between these two forms of extending the gospel. A missionary will always learn the native language of the land to which he is going so that he can use it in his work from the start. Moreover, he will strive at the outset to train a staff of native assistants and pastors, and if he is extraordinarily prudent he will help his congregation to stand on its own two feet as soon as possible so that he eventually becomes superfluous. This course of action has today become a necessity on the mission field. A Diaspora pastor, on the other hand, is called by a group of Christians who more than anything else in this world do not want to lose their ties to the land of their origin—and cannot afford to do so, if they do not want to become like chaff which is scattered to the winds. In his work he will quite legitimately maintain close connections to his home church, receiving guidance and help from her, particularly if he himself would like to retain his membership there. It would be an impermissible form of Utopianism if one were to forbid and to place under suspicion this very natural tie to the “mother-church,” and to the language, culture, and tradition of the homeland.

But just as important as the insight into the different approaches represented by “minority churches” and missions is the sensitivity to their common effort once the minority churches become relatively self-sufficient. At this point the work of the LWF

is both responsible and promising. If in the last ten years great strides have been taken in this direction, then it is not so much because of the genius and insight of the personalities involved, but because developments have continued to move forward and have produced facts beyond all theoretical discussion and controversy. For instance, the much-discussed language problem is no longer a realistic one. When a congregation becomes firmly rooted in its new land, it automatically becomes necessary to conduct the services of worship in both languages. The important thing is that the preaching be understood, and therefore the pastor must keep pace with the language needs of his congregation. There is also no longer any question but that the Diaspora churches must increasingly train more and more pastors out of their own midst. Fortunately, all of them are working energetically at this problem. With the gradual process of growth the church also becomes increasingly aware of her responsibility for evangelical witness in the environment in which she finds herself. One must, however, allow these things to grow out of her history and not try to force them.

Naturally, it is possible to impede the course of development by hanging on to familiar and cherished goals and ways of working. When one encounters in Germany, for example, those who still believe that they must continue to lead the Diaspora churches and congregations around by a string, giving the necessary brotherly help in the form of a golden chain of perpetual dependence, then one can only regret the lack of spiritual insight which is manifested by such a viewpoint. Naturally the North American influence in Latin America will also be limited by the degree to which the churches growing out of their mission activities achieve their independence. The history of missions has made that abundantly clear. Fortunately, all parties involved are agreed that a very deliberate withdrawal of direct influence in the face of the growing self-sufficiency of the mission churches is a necessary condition if brotherly fellowship and a lively spiritual exchange are to be made possible. This insight is the fruit of our world-wide ecumenical cooperation.

III

When we once more return to the concrete events in Brazil, the question arises: Why could the Lutheran Church of Brazil not

immediately accept with joy the offer of the North American mission department? Why couldn't the proposals for the practicable division of duties be trusted? The reason can be found in some very unfortunate experiences in other areas. It had frequently occurred that the North American churches conducted "Diaspora" work among German background evangelical Christians under the name of missions. Two classic examples are always cited: On the one hand the relationship between the Iglesia Luterana Unida in the Argentine and the German background La-Plata Synod and on the other hand, the long history of poor relationships between the Missouri Synod and the Synodal Federation in Brazil. This is not the place to go into these examples in detail.

In both instances, the North American missionaries did not restrict their activities to working among the so-called nominal Roman Christians, but also turned their attention to the German and other European immigrant groups. In so far as they often did concern themselves with "sheep without a shepherd" nobody can deplore their efforts; since both the missions of the United Lutheran Church in the USA and the Missouri Synod number many former German immigrants among their memberships, some of the missionaries were able to officiate in the German language.

Yet with regard to these experiences, I trust that we shall be able to put a stop to this unhappy competition so that even other Lutheran church bodies will fall in line with the model arrangements of the Synodal Federation and the mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of North America. In the recent past, a number of meetings have taken place which show promise of better relationships in the future.

On what basis did the arrangements in Brazil succeed? The Synodal Federation had not seen fit to invite the North American Mission to share in this work; rather, it had repeatedly stressed that it has been working in the North Parana area for the last 20 years, and that it supports an entire system of congregations and preaching stations there. Since the North Americans, despite this, decided to begin work in the area, the Synodal Federation reacted positively to their decision and declared its readiness to negotiate so that the bonds of brotherhood might be strengthened rather than denied. This attitude was the key to success. It was agreed

that all fundamental questions concerning the form and nature of the work will be discussed thoroughly as they arise by an official joint-commission of the two groups. The pastors and missionaries will seek fellowship with one another at their various conferences, will make their facilities available to one another and will extend a helping hand wherever possible. The mission will restrict itself to reaching the non-German population in the Portuguese language, and will only serve isolated German-speaking evangelical Christians with the approval of a pastor. This will provide little difficulty because the mission has no German speaking missionaries, because of her Norwegian background. The seminaries and other institutions will be opened to both the church and the mission personnel. If the mission, in order to help promote the independence of the work it is doing, sees fit to organize its congregations into a synod, provision has already been made that this synod will become a member of the Synodal Federation of Brazil. This is how the various ways of approach and the common goal which they all have are visualized at this time. *Vivant sequentes!*

IV

The whole question of missionary activity in South America has not yet been thoroughly studied, to say nothing of its actual practice, despite the assertion at Ghana in 1958 that South America is the most promising evangelical mission-field in the world. But one thing can be said; this continent, with its dark history of conquest and enforced "Christianization" at the hands of the medieval Roman Catholic Church, with its radical secularization following the age of enlightenment and its *avant garde* spiritual attitude, plus its immeasurable economic potentialities, needs to have the gospel preached in the Reformation tradition, so that its sense of Christian commission will gain the necessary depth.

The Evangelical Lutheran congregations of European background, by virtue of their situation as "diaspora" churches in the first instance, bear the responsibility for such a preaching of the gospel. Since they, however, had to mobilize their entire efforts to the important task of reaching their own members and binding them into congregations, their Northern American brethren in the faith were privileged to be called according

to the richness of God's plan to show their concern for the indifferent masses of Latin America through direct evangelistic activity. As more and more living and witnessing congregations and churches of the Lutheran confession grow out of these two roots, the full responsibility for their own continent will fall upon them. As a church of the Augsburg Confession their ecumenical responsibility demands that they seek to preserve and to proclaim a living witness not only over against the Church of Rome, but also against the boundless sects and cults, if they really want to serve the mission and the unity of the church in all the world. It is of great importance that in his first letter in the year 1864, the first evangelical pastor in the state of Espirito Santo wrote: "The German congregations which we shall found here must become missionaries to the many unbelievers who still live in Brazil." God scatters his people in order to advance his kingdom. Diaspora is meant to be a means of mission.

FRIEDRICH HÜBNER

Japan

One Hundred Years of Protestantism

THE 374,784 PROTESTANT Christians of Japan celebrate this year the one hundredth anniversary of the coming of the first missionaries to their country.¹

The National Christian Council chose the first week of November for its Anniversary Week. Special services were held throughout the country on Sunday, November 1st. Actually the first Protestant missionary, J. Liggins, arrived in Japan on May 2nd, 1859. Therefore May this year was chosen by the Japan Protestant Centennial Committee² for the printing of a well-illustrated four-page special supplement to the four leading English newspapers³ and a "Kickoff

Rally" in Tokyo with speakers mainly from abroad.

As the protestant church now rounds the 100 year mark, it will want to take stock of its own status. Here are some facts, figures and observations: few of the Protestant congregations have more than 500 members (2.2%). Membership normally runs from 40—100 (31.7%), and one-fifth of the congregations have less than 20 members. Most of these churches are organized after western patterns, each with a theologically trained, ordained pastor. The small congregations obviously cannot pay their pastor a decent salary, which means that he must supplement it, either by a kindergarten arrangement, or else the congregation becomes permanently dependent on outside subsidies. This is not the place to analyse these phenomena. Yet it is difficult to resist recording the observation that the 100 years old Protestant Church in Japan has not found a place for effective lay leadership. Also, what would it not mean for the diaspora Christians in Japan to meet every so often in a *Kirchentag*-type gathering! Some of the newer religious sects in Japan gather their followers as often as twice a year, and attribute much of their numerical strength and spiritual vitality to this fact.

Against the background that the Protestant Church is clergy led, perhaps even clergy dominated, it is interesting to note that at least three of the very early missionaries who left lasting marks on the life of the church (and indeed of the nation) were laymen. I am thinking of Hepburn (medical doctor), Clark (biologist and educator) and Janes (military officer). Perhaps one may ascribe some of the trends in the "Non-church-movement" (*Mu-kyo-kai*) to the influence of Dr. Clark's critical individualism, otherwise the all too common "one-man-congregations" show little of the layman initiative so amply exhibited by the early missionaries.

Most Christians in Japan live as single believers in the midst of non-Christian families and communities. This has been regarded as a weakness of the church of Japan. Certainly, the Christian family is the basis for sound congregational life. However, the same fact also means that the Christians in Japan are less in danger of falling into the lure of Christian communalism, which in some of the other Asian countries is perhaps danger number one. The Japanese Christian rubs shoulders every day with his non-Christian fellow citizens.

¹ The 1959 *Japan Christian Year Book* has these figures:
(Total population: 92,000,000)

Protestant	374,784
Catholic	241,745
Orthodox	34,659
Total	651,188

² The organization behind this name is apparently the Evangelical Missionary Association of Japan.

³ Too well illustrated in fact. One of the editors (very much alive and not logically connected with the 100 year celebration) managed to have his picture appear three times—to Liggins' once!

This may be one reason why Japan has produced a remarkable number of outstanding Christian personalities. The lack of freedom in the Meiji era (1868-1912), in fact right up till 1945, demanded courage and conviction of each Christian, and in a greater degree of the leaders. The names Uchimura, Neejima, Uemura and hundreds of others call forth respect and admiration. These were Christian heroes, men of faith.

Christian men brought to Japan hospitals and schools. Few countries have relatively more imposing educational and medical institutions. Japan is the only nation I know of that has managed to transplant the fruits of the Christian religion without itself becoming a Christian nation.

Post-war Japan is a peace-loving nation, taught a lesson by the destructive force of the atom bomb. This state of mind has been largely ignored by the church and greatly capitalized upon by numerous leftist labour unions.

Christian influence must be credited with the elevation of womanhood in Japan, the abolition of legalized prostitution (1957), and the improvement of the lot of the laboring classes. The name of Toyohiko Kagawa deserves honorable mention in this connection, a man who sacrificed his health and life to help people in the slums. Eighteen members of the Diet are Christians, some in leading posts.

In the 100% literate nation it appears that present day missionary strategy neglects the use of the press. This is the more strange, since newspaper evangelism only a few decades ago was one of the most effective ways of reaching individuals with the gospel. That the radio in this respect has now replaced the old type newspaper evangelism is true,⁴ but this is no excuse for lack of imaginative use of the secular and religious press.

In 1859 there were six Protestant missionaries in Japan. Today the figure is 1,915, of whom 342 are working under the United Church of Christ,⁵ with 1,597 having other affiliations. A more informative way of cataloguing the missionaries may be to see

with what missionary fellowship they hold membership, though even here there is overlapping and there are a number of hidden factors not appearing in simple statistics. Attempts to divide the missionaries into "evangelicals" and on the other side presumably "non-evangelicals" have not met with much enthusiasm.⁶

Of the 1,915 missionaries, 15% are related to the United Church of Christ (Kyodan). The majority of the missionaries are American. Only 29 of the 144 missionary societies originate in Europe; 295 missionaries are Lutheran.

The Fellowship of Christian Missionaries, with roots back to pre-war days, is what the name would imply, a fellowship of Christian missionaries regardless of doctrine or church affiliation. It does not engage in evangelistic or other missionary activities, but publishes the *Japan Christian Quarterly*.⁷ The Evangelical Missionary Association of Japan, with a doctrinal basis, has since its founding after the last war been very active both in evangelistic and literary efforts. A bi-monthly magazine, *Japan Harvest*,⁸ is published. A number of missionaries hold dual membership in these two missionary fellowships. A smaller group, mainly ICCM related, is associated with the separatist Japan Bible Christian Council, and publishes a bi-lingual *Bible Times*.

The 14th Convention on Christian Education (in Japan called Sunday School Convention) was held in Tokyo in 1958, and was reported to have made "a deep impression upon the Japanese public in general and the Christian Church in particular".⁹ Roughly 5,000 delegates attended, among them 1,200 from overseas, representing a total of 62 nations.

Though the conference was held last year, it has been repeatedly spoken of in connection with the 100 year mark. It is perhaps dangerous to draw conclusions from these things, being oneself so far away from the scene, but it may be symbolic that the year 1959 will not be remembered as a year in which the Christian churches of Japan made any

⁴ *Kiristo Shimbum*, February 1959, reports a total of 23 programs by 13 organizations. Two programs are daily, the rest weekly.

⁵ The Kyodan claims a membership of 175,506; 1,501 ordained pastors serving 1,536 congregations. The 14 Lutheran groups, the majority of which will soon form a united Japan Evangelical Lutheran Church, have 13,274 members, 173 pastors and lay workers.

⁶ EMAJ publications have used this device, thereby, for instance, landing the Episcopalians in the non-evangelical group, while the Lutherans were fortunate enough to be filed under "evangelicals."

⁷ Contains mainly scholarly articles on missionary problems.

⁸ Mainly popular articles, attractively (sometimes frivolously) edited.

⁹ The *Japan Christian Year Book*, 1959, page 10. (The Jubilee edition has 616 pages to the normal 350-400.)

great forward stride; rather these purely external events such as the 1958 convention, the publication of a new translation of the Christian classics, etc., will come to mind. In the immediate background hovers the anxiety that the Grand Shrine at Ise may once again be made a national Mecca as in pre-war days.

SIGURD ASKE

Germany

The Development of the Sociology of Religion in Germany

WITHIN CHURCH CIRCLES a relatively large interest is brought to sociological studies of religion. It arises out of the expectation that such studies may help the church to get a proper answer, how it ought to meet the changes occurring in many realms of contemporary society and human experience. However, many who read the more recent studies, in the expectation of finding formulas for the solution of the pressing practical questions of church life, are disappointed. An articulate but impracticable picture is presented, which leads to the recognition that the developing problems cannot easily be conquered. Even though these studies cannot fulfill the hope of dispensing advice, the following is an attempt to describe how they can provide a new foundation for the recognition of the church's position as well as for the consideration of its mission. What may superficially appear as a refusal to come to terms with the demands of practicality can be of value for a clearer statement of the problem.

If we turn to the origin of the German sociological studies of religion since the war, we see that comprehensive presentations instead of single empirical studies stand at the beginning of the development. They throw open the complete realm of problems and sketch a new organisational structure of the church, fitted to the changes in the society. This research has given the direction to further developments in this field by contrasting the reality of contemporary society with the small group of faithful followers in the

church. In addition, these studies have pointed the way for further investigation in the sociology of religion by considering the changes in the social structure in the context of their meaning for the church. In order to communicate an idea of the insights and conclusions of these sociological studies it is necessary to observe in these reports the different impulses which give a critical review of the extant religious movement.

First, by means of social-historical reference, the historical situation of religion and the influence of the church in the contemporary era is described. At the beginning of recent times the leading social groups left the church. The church did not relate itself to the decisive social force in the Industrial Age, the working class. Until recent times the alliance of governmental and church-power was responsible for the various social levels. This union of secular and clerical power is now broken. The church seeks its members from a completely secularized society which develops its norms of responsibility out of itself. For an observer judging from the outside the church has the character of a private institution. Even though the historical factors which led to the disassociation of church and society are to be found further in the past, their wide-spread effect is just now beginning to be felt.

Secondly, the research leads to the recognition of the missionary task. It was discovered that the local congregations tend to exist in a state of inner self-satisfaction marked by an increasingly narrowing *milieu*. Because the parish withholds itself from the broad plane of modern society, it does not fulfil its functions in the present world, nor does it satisfy the expectations with which the church finds itself confronted by the new social structure. In order to overcome the isolationist character of the church it is necessary to focus the attention on the problems, where the service of the church is presently needed and where the church on account of her office of charity is challenged in today's world.

Furthermore, these observations lead up to the point that requests for a new order of parish organisation are to be taken seriously. Next to the parish structure with its fixed church services, circles, and events, new loose groups have arisen in connection with the Evangelical Academies, the social work, and the student congregations. They seem to have little in common with the characteristic local congregation in its typical style of clinging together. Reference is being made to the experiences of an open and

articulate congregation and its significance for the whole church.

These presentations are valuable in so far as they draw attention to the fact that the church can easily lag behind the social changes. Through this failure to keep up with the social evolution the church loses the possibility of being heard in the contemporary world as well as being understood in its social service. However, uncertainty remains for the reader. He observes that this sociological research hardly concerns itself with the coherence of the local church parish. It merely touches lightly upon the external aspects of religious life in the local parish without investigating the existing kind of membership in regard to the statements made. For it is the local parish which remains the essential gatherer of church membership and offers the usual forms of religious behavior to its membership. The consideration of socio-historical factors demonstrates that a large part of the population is not reached by the church but it does not carry through its analysis to the church members and the nature of their relationship to the church.

Thus, when one speaks of the service and task of the church, no connection is made with the existing forms of church life. The social estate of the church itself already contains an answer to the question what form her service to society has to take. If it is necessary to revise the tasks of the church, it is not sufficient to describe where the church must exercise her responsibility; on the contrary, the new view of the church's commission must come to grips with the answers already present in the life of the congregation. The new perspectives must be checked on as to whether they are really meeting the contemporary situation in terms of both limits and possibilities.

This step was completed in the following period by the empirical studies of congregations and their religious life. These studies refrained from problematic thought and concentrated on a methodical description of the decisive traits and lines of present religious commitment. It is remarkable that these empirical studies were written at approximately the same time with very little contact between the authors. Also noteworthy is the fact that they used different research devices, corresponding to the character of the work as a preliminary study or an experiment. When the authors elucidate and present their material it is even more astonishing that all independently chose the same direction. The essential value

of all these single studies lies precisely in the common direction which their empirically grounded conclusions indicate.

These studies confirm that the religious movement is not centered around a core-group of religiously-minded people only to decrease continuously within the broad population. Instead, the only way to comprehend the phenomenon of the religious movement is to distinguish between various forms of religious commitment among the population. They differ from one another in the pattern of behaviour and the affinity towards certain customs in the local congregation, as well as in the presentation of faith and the conception of the church's task. For each form of belief the problem arises anew as to where the extent of its obligation becomes a non-committal acknowledgement of the church. It is not possible from the standpoint of the church's existence as a social institution to judge in which form of participation an essential commitment is evident and in which social motives may take precedence. Even though adjustment and patterns of behavior differ from each other, each member feels his form of commitment to the church to be a complete expression of his membership. R. Köster describes three adjacent forms of belief, all of which are verified in the investigated parish. The first group observes the church as a "moral institution." For the second group the church is above all a "communion for those, who share a certain conviction." The third group takes the church to be an "institute for pietistic entertainment in a religious, aesthetic manner and for social welfare." H. O. Wölber speaks of the "church in between," which is characterized not by a faith which calls for specific decisions, but by the help it gives in the practical problems of life and the intellectual calm and security it provides. In contrast, the ecclesiastical teachings, the firmness of participation and the religious forming of one's own self are vital for the inner circle of the church members and build the center of their faith. Whether or not the events and circles sponsored by the congregation and the church services are attended disproportionately, both claim to belong wholly to the church. T. Rendtorff observes the following levels of contemporary religious behavior: first, the congregation reveals itself in the form of the parochial organisation. Secondly, it branches out into the life of the community through various clubs and associations. Thirdly there is the level of "church

affiliation from a distance," the institutional basis of which is an occasional contact with church groups. To this view correspond the observations of the author on broad material of religio-sociological origin both in Germany and in foreign countries: different forms of church participation must be distinguished from each other—the type of participation which has its center of gravity in the attendance of church services, the form of participation which centers in the groups within the parish, and, finally, the kind of connection with the church which consists more or less of general support for the goals of the church. Even the pastor's view of his ministry in its various possible emphases reflects such differentiated manifestations of religiosity.

Because of the recent empirical studies, the problem shifts decisively from its position in the earlier general presentations. If one recognizes how sharply defined the relationship to the church is, one must carefully consider whether a change in the conception of church-membership might not lie behind the leaving of the church accompanying the expansion of the modern social structure. This change cannot be judged alone in the sense of the parochial organization according to church attendance or the claims upon the pastoral services. Furthermore, the interest in determining the present religious needs in regard to the church by means of an analysis of the social structure decreases. It seems much more important to consider whether the perception that the parish church has closed itself off and isolated itself from the concerns of the day, may not have its roots in the view of the parish as a limited and closed group of members. If one attempts to grasp the situation in terms of categories, according to the research studies mentioned, it becomes evident, that a series of types of religious behavior extending into the broader population meet in the parish church. Depending upon the definition chosen for religious commitment, the situation in the local community may be described as uncommitted openness, infrequent ritual participation, or close fellowship. Finally one can easily place the new forms of group work on such an orderly map of religious commitment. In them an alteration of religious commitment comprehending the church mainly as an organization among the various social pressure groups finds its institutional frame.

Empirically one is forced to deal seriously with the recognition that church life in the

individual parish is scarcely so lifeless as it may appear from one particular standpoint within the expressions of religious commitment. Opposing forms of religious obedience clash in the structure of the parish church. The isolation of the church from the society might just result from the fact that one particular evaluation and insight into the church's situation tends to push the piety or convictions of others out of the realm of the church. This one-sided development of religious commitment has a tendency to disqualify "old-fashioned" or "modern" or merely different forms of belief from being legally related to the church.

One must not forget, however, that the preceding thoughts are dependent on the earlier sociological observations. What is the connection between the sociological propositions and the theological consciousness of the function and form of the church? It is necessary to raise this question frankly. One can demonstrate with empirical and sociological methods that the various forms of religious commitment do not just contain a fragment loosed from the tradition of the church, they imply rather a conviction and a view of the task of the church, but this does not justify any of these forms theologically or release them from the theological judgments which shape the church life has to take in today's world. The purpose in evaluating these empirical studies in terms of their relevance for church procedures is to discover the challenge in the situation. The level of mere fact-finding is then left behind.

The relationship between the theological and the sociological statements, as the theme is formulated in the above-mentioned studies, was discussed in a series of conferences of theologians and social scientists. In the conversation two types of argument revealed themselves, through which one can evade the problems demonstrated by the studies in the sociology of religion.

The first argument stems from the relativity of all sociological analysis: sociological research describes the symptoms of religious commitment purposely in a rather wide manner; it avoids *nuances* which could reflect a more complete expression of the religious life in the present era. The attempt to derive questions with the help of a methodological abstraction of a social character lies behind this research, but a true answer is evaded. In the nature of sociology there is a scientific method of observation upon which one cannot

base a theological system. The theologian must not let the sociologist raise the issues, because his theology may then become dependent upon a scientific attitude which contradicts the practical orientation of religious thinking. Only, therefore, a doctrine of the church based on theology can solve the problem of the form and function of the church.

The second type of argument stresses the changes in the social structure through history until the present. The various types of faith and structural elements of the parish as discovered by the sociological research are disposed in proper order in the course of social history which, of course, includes the church as a social institution. Contemporary and disappearing forms of church life are separated from each other when viewed from the standpoint of social history. The principal problem is: where are the orders of parish life to be found which correspond to the peculiar design of the modern social structure? In the discussion there is no consideration of the theological consciousness that the religious institutions preserve patterns for obedience in faith, since the social manifestations of the church are understood here only as external forms bound to change with the social upheaval and ever newly to be filled with personal faith. Here again one is aware of the fact that theological and sociological propositions stand in contrast to each other. The difficulty is solved by evaluating the realm of church forms apart from theological considerations. The judgment of the social position and function of the church is then derived from the analysis of society.

Both types of argument agree in that they use the results of empirical investigation only as a means to obtain a general picture within which concrete religious problems are to be grasped and classified. This comprehensive view is sought either in a doctrine of the church or in a definition of the social position of the church in modern society. This advance toward the solution of the problem is conditioned by the insight that there is no bridge between the analytical view of sociology and the religious assertion of value. Both manners of argumentation, however, neglect one fact: there is no doubt, that the theologian cannot have the raising of his questions dictated by the sociological studies. But this does not exclude that the very questions which contain the sociological results become efficacious for theological reflection

under a different pattern. The relevant utilization of the empirical studies of religion seems to exist in the transposition of the impulses to be found in sociological results into a new, parallel manner for the theological application.

Thus the results of the extant sociological research can be formulated as follows: how are we to interpret the fact that various forms of the Christian life, for which religious commitment is not to be denied, exist in the same church? Or, more sharply stated: what is the meaning of the fact that in the same church different responses of a complete obedience can be given to the biblical message? The problems of ordering the life of the congregation are often given precedence to problems of the proclamation and the content of the church service. One might well think that the separation of the church from the world is encouraged through this evaluation of church problems. It would be worth considering whether it may not be the different responses of obedience that keep alive the struggle for right obedience; while the one-sided attempt to organize a Christian life obliges oneself exclusively to particular institutions, thus destroying the proper relationship between faith and life.

We indicated at the outset that sociological research has not made the answer to the problem of what must be reformed in the church any easier. Perhaps it is the function of this type of investigation to point out the possibilities as well as the limits of social behavior in the realm of the church.

JUSTUS FREYTAG

E. Müller: *Die Welt ist anders geworden*. Hamburg, 1955. E. zur Nieden: *Die Gemeinde nach dem Gottesdienst*. Stuttgart, 1955. H. H. Ulrich: *Die Kirche und ihre missionarische Aufgabe*. Berlin, 1955. H. D. Wendland: *Die Kirche in der modernen Gesellschaft*. Hamburg, 1957. K. von Bismarck: *Die christliche Gemeinde im Strukturwandel der Gesellschaft*. Stuttgart, 1957. *Ibid: Kirche und Gemeinde in soziologischer Sicht*. ZEE, 1957, No 1. M. Langhans: *Kirche auf neuen Wegen*. Stuttgart, 1957. H. Schelsky: *Ist die Dauerreflexion institutionalisierbar?* ZEE, 1957, No 4. E. Schleth: *Der profane Weltchrist*. Munich, 1957. H. Storck: *Die Zeit drängt*. Berlin, 1957. T. Rendtorff: *Die soziale Struktur der Gemeinde*. Hamburg, 1958. J. Freytag: *Die Kirchengemeinde in soziologischer*

Sicht. Hamburg, 1959. R. Köster: *Die Kirchentreuen.* Stuttgart, 1959. H. Schelsky: *Religionssoziologie und Theologie.* ZEE, 1959, No. 4. *Soziologie der Kirchengemeinde*, edited by D. Goldschmidt, F. Greiner, H. Schelsky. Stuttgart, 1959. H. O. Wölber: *Religion ohne Entscheidung.* Göttingen, 1959.

Hungary

The Imperial Charter for the Protestants of Hungary in the Last Century

THE HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH in Czechoslovakia and in Hungary evidences many characteristics and experiences common to the suffering yet resolute course of Protestantism everywhere. However, there are also some features which are unique. These extraordinary events in the life of our church derive from the special political, cultural, and ethnic situations which she has faced. This article will deal with one such extraordinary historical occurrence. Our object in the first instance is not to present an historical survey, but to attempt a theological- and spiritual explanation of the event. The answer to the question whether this situation is related in any special manner to the spiritual heritage of the Lutheran Church is self-evident.

On September 1, 1859, the imperial charter was proclaimed, followed the next day by the organization of the clergy. These two acts gave the Hungarian church a legal constitution for which very influential churchmen of the evangelical churches had been working long before the official edict.

What was the occasion of this act with which Emperor Franz Joseph I publicly interfered in the autonomy of our church? Was it an attempt to rule autocratically and thus subordinate the evangelical churches? By no means. The motives behind this charter were sincere. One can safely say, that the anti-Protestant attitudes of the royal house of Habsburg no longer existed at this time. After the ten-year period of absolutism which followed the ill-fated Magyar revolution of 1848-49 the government sought to regulate the evangelical churches in order to protect them from the political objectives and plans of their patrons.

Unfortunately, because of the irresoluteness of the government, just the opposite occurred, that is, the charter became the source of boundless political agitation. But we do not want to get ahead of our story. The events consequent to the suppression of the revolution had affected the church greatly, because she also was under the resulting state of emergency. The former bishops were replaced by administrators, the general and district conventions (synods) were forbidden, and the regional and congregational conventions could only be held with the permission of the state authorities and in the presence of the commissioner of the state. All of these emergency measures were removed by the charter.

The imperial charter and the appointment of the ministers not only returned her former rights to the church, but these were even expanded by the addition of some new ones. So on the one hand, the charter was an occasion for rejoicing. The congregations and regions organized themselves in keeping with the charter and sent the emperor letters of thanks from their conventions. This positive acceptance of the charter was particularly widespread on the part of the pastors and all those who had the best interests of the church at heart. A few even viewed the charter as an opportunity for a second reformation of the Hungarian evangelical church. Therefore it came as no surprise that, in the course of six months, approximately 350 congregations, more than half of the total number, had organized themselves in keeping with the provisions of the charter.

On the other hand, the patrons and influential social classes were very unhappy about the charter. They saw clearly that this spelled an end to their exploitation of the church for their own political purposes. Their opposition to the charter provided them with an occasion for opposing the government and the emperor. After 10 years of absolute rule with the suppression of political rights, a chance for public opposition was presented under the banner of protecting the autonomy of the church. But this defence of a so-called holy, unwritten right and the resistance to the alleged hierarchical lusts of the clergy finally led to the dissolution of the church. In this struggle every means was justified, even the exploitation of the inner court circles whose influence was used to persuade the emperor to recall the charter. At the conventions at which the congregations or

the regions were to organize themselves according to the provisions of the charter, the opposition used every means in order to gain the majority. If this did not work, counter-conventions were held. When all of these methods failed, a virtual inquisition was initiated against those pastors who were loyal to the charter, which showed no lack of defamation, physical violence, rabble-rousing and financial pressure. In this way the confused populace became possessed with the illusion that it was waging "war against the clergy." Everywhere, in the city as well as in the villages, the church was affected by this deep turmoil, with the result that after one year only scattered ruins of the so-called "charter churches" remained in only one district. When one asks how this was possible, it is necessary to cite that alongside the above-mentioned powerful opposition of the secular orders to the charter and the fanaticism of the basically uneducated masses, one must recognize a third very important factor, namely, that the year of the edict was one of the weakest in the foreign politics of the Vienna government. In 1859 the Vienna government suffered a decisive military defeat in northern Italy, which meant that it had to vacate those areas of Italy which had been under its control. The government sought to make up for this defeat in international politics by policies on the domestic scene, particularly with regard to Hungary. The method chosen by the government was not to support the charter, in order to calm the fears of certain groups of Hungarian politicians. Thereby the exponents of the charter, and these were mainly pastors without the benefit of official protective custody, were made the victims of the attacks of the "autonomists." Only a small group of congregations in the districts of Nitra, Trentschin, and Orawa remained loyal to the charter until the mutual reconciliation at the general convention of 1867. Even this compromise meeting was conditioned by the political agreement between Austria and Hungary, which gives added evidence to the degree to which the inner affairs of the Hungarian Church have always been influenced by political events.

It would, however, be an exaggeration to say that the spiritual proceedings were directly determined by the charter. They were primarily determined by the intellectual and theological developments in the 19th century, which more or less became the

criteria by which state-policies concerning the church were tested. This distinction is more clearly seen when one looks a little more closely at the two groups, those who remained true to the charter and those who fought for autonomy.

The confessional stand of the leaders of the movement for autonomy was unclear, because they regarded it as more or less unimportant. Among the secular classes there was even a rather outspoken rejection of confessional standards. This was essentially the heritage of the rationalism of the preceding years. The instructions at the ordination of the newly-elected bishops of the autonomy party urged them to do away with the ancient forms of worship and church traditions and to initiate new reforms. The new superintendents were to provide the church with new agendas, catechisms, hymnals and textbooks, which should be written in the progressive spirit of religion. Their main objective should be, as soon as possible, to reunite the "two brother churches which were without reason divided, to the great damage of universal protestantism" (namely the Lutheran and the Reformed).

It was attempted to make this the point of departure for the gradual elimination of the Lutheran form of worship and, all in all, of Lutheran teaching. Some 20 years before, many very important leaders of the autonomy party had already given open allegiance to these goals.

In their ordination oath the superintendents did not have to pledge their loyalty to the symbolic books of the church, and had anyone sought to call attention to this very fundamental confessional duty, he would have been met with the stock answer: "My dear brother, forget the theological dissensions of the 16th and 17th centuries, they are an anachronism in our modern world." The attacks in the official newspaper of the charter supporters *Cirkevné listy* (church publications) lead eventually to a retreat and to a partial reinstatement of the former bishops. Furthermore, these charges were not made in vain, for they served to define the church's doctrinal position and what was at the time regarded as stubborn refusal on the part of those loyal to the charter was their means of protecting the office of the ministry as defined by the confessions of the church.

The second result of the controversy was the awareness of the necessary boundaries

between church and state and the renewed application of the doctrine of the "two kingdoms." Because they had allowed this teaching to fall into neglect, the autonomists had been able to misuse the church for their own political purposes. This is particularly evident in the attitude of Inspector General Carl Zays, who was removed from office during the state of emergency. He understood the church merely in terms of the political and national needs which she could satisfy. Furthermore, he wanted to organize a united evangelical church as a political block against the ruling house and the politically active Catholicism. Since the decline of Poland, it was his dream that a strong Hungary should arise to assume her political position, a Hungary molded by a strong sense of the Magyar tradition. At one point he said: "It is not important whether we are Lutherans or Calvinists, Orthodox or Roman Catholics, Christians or Jews, but we must all be Magyars." Or, in other words, "Protestantism and the Magyar tradition go hand in hand." And his position was continued by his successors in the office of Inspector General of the church, such as Anton Radvánszky, one of the most important opponents of the charter at the General Convention of 1879, who said: "Because of the identity of her constitution with that of the state, the church in our country is under a primary obligation to further the interests of the state. In order to adequately fulfill this task, care must be taken in our church schools, that our youth, even in their childhood, become imbued with the Magyar way of thinking and feeling." For these men the only purpose of the church was that of promoting the political and national program. The methods used in the controversy were accordingly chosen. Extensive use was made of political propaganda, agitation of the masses, pamphlets, and influential persons at court. In a report by Superintendent Geduly at the General Convention of 1862, the supporters of the charter were even identified with panslavic elements. In later years this accusation was to have tragic consequences, because it incensed the Magyar people against the churches of Slovakian background. To be "panslavic" was almost regarded as a canonical offense and anyone suspected of espousing this position was refused an office in the church.

The particular political stamp of the Autonomy Party is clearly evident from the titles

of the pamphlets which were written in order to will the support of the European public such as "Politics in Austria and the Protestant Question in Hungary" (1860), "Vital Questions for Austria" (Brunswick, 1860), "Religious Liberty and Protestantism in Hungary" (Paris and Brussels, 1860). Since the autonomists were well acquainted with western public opinion, they hoped to capitalize on the sympathy which the Kossuth rebellion had awakened for Hungary.

Unfortunately, these tendencies to merge the interests of church and state were in no way lessened during the controversy over the charter. On the contrary, even those who were committed to defend the natural rights of both church and state came under their influence. The church became the instrument of politics. The recognition that the church must take a position in the questions of public and political life, while at the same time maintaining her independence and defending herself against those who would seek to use her for their own political objectives, was a lesson learned at the cost of tremendous suffering.

The most obvious result of the chicanery of the clergy was to lessen the respect for the ministry and to minimize the importance of church work. Twenty years later traces of this attitude could still be found. At the General Convention of 1879 Inspector General Anton Radvánszky complained that "the fine co-operation between pastor and congregation" no longer exists. This was borne out in the false understanding of the concept of the universal priesthood of all believers which prevailed. The Calvinists interpreted this to mean that all must begin to take a direct part in the direction and government of the church, while the Lutherans understood it in relationship to justification and sanctification. The over-exaggerated importance of the secular elements in the church gradually diminished with the course of time, but even the fairly recent establishment of an independent office of bishop-general alongside that of inspector-general is a formal attempt to equalize the secular and spiritual interests in the government of the church. A good example of the "de-confessionalization" of the office of the ministry is the instruction given at the ordination of the newly-elected autonomous bishops to which reference has already been made. It represents the spirit of a movement which forced itself upon the church, and then exploited the name of the church

and her organs in order to put across its ideas and principles.

The Calvinistic influence can also be attested in the importance which the proponents of autonomy gave to the constitution of the church and the questions concerning it. The autonomy of the church was declared as "holy," and there was no lack of voices, who saw this as the fundamental principle of Protestantism. Constitutional questions became more important than doctrinal questions. The General Convention of 1860 issued a formal declaration to all congregations which no longer recognized those churches supporting the merger as part of the Protestantism of Hungary, because they had rejected their autonomy.

Many of the falsehoods and calumnies directed at the church were the product of the rationalistic temper of the times and were present in other churches and theological positions too. Because of this, people who should have stood together for the truth became opponents, and one can rightly say that the persecutions which the Jesuits conducted against our church were not nearly as damaging as this inner dissension. When one looks for the reasons behind this development, the following can be listed: first of all, the surrendering of a doctrine of the church

based on biblical revelation and the confessional standards of the church, and beyond that the neglect of a biblical christology. The confessional differences were made light of, which was only possible because those who had the strongest influence over the church, were scarcely familiar with the doctrine of the church, at least not with its biblical foundation. Therefore, instead of taking the biblical witness as the pattern for the church, the "spirit of humanity" and "general culture" became the norms.

The consequences were and are immeasurable. The resultant leaders of the church did not seek to adopt biblical perspectives and foundations, hence the church accommodated herself to false goals and embarked upon a mistaken course of playing politics. The only thing which saved the church, and which has perhaps preserved her to this day, is the silent and faithful service of many unknown men, not the least of which are the simple pastors in the villages who withstood the struggle in the narrowest of all personal relationships. When one looks at the condition of the church in this century, one must certainly not forget the service which these have rendered her.

OTTO VIZNER

BOOK REVIEWS

Interconfessional Studies

DENNOCH BRÜDER. *Catholic-Protestant relations. An exchange of letters between Pastor Jean Rilliet and Canon L. Christiani. German translation by Irmgard Vogelsanger-De Roche. Zürich: H. Böniger, 1955. 283 pp. DM 13.30.*

DIE STEINE DES ANSTOSSES. *Catholic-Protestant relations. New edition. Exchange of letters between Pastor Jean Rilliet and Canon Christiani. German translation by Irmgard Vogelsanger-De Roche. Zürich: H. Böniger, 1957. 267 pp.*

CHRISTEN SUCHEIN EINE KIRCHE. *J. P. Michael. The Ecumenical Movement and Rome. Herder-Bücherei, Volume 10. Freiburg: Herder, 1958. 188 pp.*

ONE IN CHRIST. *K. E. Skydsgaard. Translated by Axel C. Kildegaard. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1957. 220 pp. US \$4.00.*

DIE KATHOLIZITÄT DER KIRCHE. *Contributions to the exchange between the Evangelical and Roman Catholic Churches. Edited by Hans Asmussen and Wilhelm Stählin. Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1957. 390 pp.*

SKANDALON. *The nature of Catholicism. By Joseph Klein. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1958. 464 pp. DM 25.00.*

These six diverse contributions to the current theological discussion between Roman Catholics and Protestants all assume as self-evident that what unites the Confessions is more important than what separates them. It is clear that this presupposition is the really revolutionary element in present-day Protestant-Roman Catholic relations; and so it is astonishing how much it is taken for granted, especially by Protestant authors.

We need to remind ourselves that there is nothing self-evident about it. It seems that, traditionally, Protestants have generally suspected that only poor Catholics could be good Christians, and that anyone whose faith corresponded fully to Roman teaching and practice could not be thought of as truly believing in Christ, but rather in an idolatrous, man-made system of self-salvation.

The main theological reason why this extreme view has so largely disappeared is to be found in another change reflected in all the Protestant contributions we shall consider. The doctrine of justification is no longer the center of debate. Many defects are still attributed to Roman dogma at this point, but it is now usually agreed that it does not teach salvation by works, and that it admits the *sola gratia* and even, in a sense, the *sola fide*. It does not, therefore, pervert the very center of the gospel in the way in which it appeared to do at the time of the Reformation, and so it is assumed—rather too easily, perhaps—that there are no other grounds on which equally grave accusations can be made.

The first four of our books are aimed at the general reader. Two of them, *Dennoch Brüder* and *Die Steine des Anstosses*, are translations from the French which present, in contemporary form, a 19th century view of the differences between the churches which, I suspect, still represents majority opinion on both the Roman Catholic and Protestant sides. They consist of two series of letters exchanged between a priest and a Reformed Swiss pastor on, first, the articles of the Apostles' Creed and, second, special topics of controversy such as the saints, the Virgin Mary, the sacraments, celibacy, and the authority of the church. It is easy to understand their popular success, for they are often piquantly polemical and yet display great courtesy and love. Indeed, they are so courteous that the reader may well not notice how badly the Protestant, RILLIET, loses argument after argument. His difficulty is that he is still basically a liberal, but no longer a consistent one. He fights against the Roman Church in the name of the free individual standing directly, without intermediaries, before God (*Dennoch*, 131 f., *Steine*, 197 f.), yet expresses his "unbounded respect" for tradition (*Steine*, 253), appeals often to the church fathers and, despite his underlying individualism, wants to maintain the importance of the visible church. When CHRISTIANI, following a line now often rejected by other Roman Catholic controversialists, argues that the great sin of the Reformers was to destroy human freedom by their deterministic predestinarianism and insistence on human passivity (*Dennoch*, 24 ff., 84), Rilliet can only reply (45, 87)—not quite

accurately, as his opponent triumphantly points out (117)—that Augustine was in this respect just as bad. On what appears to both of them the basic issue of the liberty of the individual versus the authority of the church, Christiani argues again and again: If you really believe that Jesus Christ was the omniscient Son of God, it is an "insupportable blasphemy" (158) to suppose that he would not make effective his desire for the unity of his disciples by establishing an authoritative church to guard against the scandalous divisions which arise apart from it. Rilliet has no effective answer. He wants unity and rejects the old liberal principle that diversity is in itself good, but he ends up by saying that one must accept as Christian everyone who is loyal to whatever he understands Christ to be, and cites the Ecumenical Movement as evidence of the effectiveness of this approach to unity (Steine, 251). "What," Christiani asks, "would you accept the Gnostics?" (242). "Of course not," Rilliet replies, but gives no hint as to how he would exclude them (248).

It may be that part of Rilliet's problem is that, in a public debate of this sort, it is harder to present a Protestant than a Roman Catholic position on such questions as the relationship of Christ's divinity to omniscience, the meaning of "truth" and "unity in the truth," and the relation of Scriptural authority to historical criticism. Rilliet avoids such themes, apparently on the grounds that they would bewilder the ordinary reader and make the apparent clarity of Catholic rationalism even more impressive. He finds it easier to combat this kind of rationalism with another kind, that of 19th century individualism, with the result, as we have seen, that the logic of his argument is impaired. Not, however, its persuasive power, for his appeal is addressed to what are still some of the deepest convictions of Western man. Christiani, despite his logical superiority, is less convincing to most non-Roman Catholics and, probably, also to many Catholics.

Another Roman Catholic presentation, MICHAEL'S *Christen suchen Eine Kirche*, is much more convincing. Because it takes the Ecumenical Movement seriously, it is not as contemptuous of the diversity outside the Roman Church as is Christiani. More important, the author does not talk as if unity were an end in itself, but focuses attention on the end which unity should serve, "the salvation of the world" (157). The mistake

of Protestantism in the past lies in its individualistic "concentration of faith on Jesus as savior and redeemer", on "the comforting word of forgiveness", on a "wholly personal assurance of salvation" (97, 157). But through the experience of missionary work (24) and of the totalitarian state (97), it is now being realized that the church must act on society as well as individuals, and that it must therefore be a united and disciplined community as well as the place where the word of forgiveness is proclaimed (158). Michael concludes that it is the dawning recognition of this truth which is the valid motive behind all the diverse forms of ecumenicity, but he naturally holds that it can achieve its adequate expression only in a radical transformation of the idea of the church in a Catholic direction.

This line of argument, presents a challenge which needs to be taken more seriously by evangelicals.

The greater part of the book is a competent and sympathetic survey of the history of the Ecumenical Movement, and the Roman Catholic attitude towards it, with special reference to Germany.

Prof. SKYDSGAARD, author of *One in Christ*, is already known to readers of the *Lutheran World* as the first research fellow of the Lutheran Foundation for Interconfessional Research. His book is in many respects a model for popular comparisons of Lutheran and Roman theology.

Skydsgaard emphasizes that we must throw ourselves into the encounter with Roman Catholicism motivated by a passionate desire to actualize the unity which is in Christ, willing to learn, to be challenged, to change, and yet have the courage to frustrate our deepest longings by saying "no" for the sake of truth. "Yet even our 'no'... can never be self-sufficient or pharisaical... for in the 'no' to the other part there lies a relentless 'no' to ourselves in our own isolation and confinement, in our own churches' pride and self-glory" (23). In short, "we must endure the division without accepting it," even while actively trying to overcome it (18).

In accordance with these principles, this book represents a search for unity, frustrated by the honest facing of differences, which nevertheless does not lapse into despair. Yet, as is proper in discussions of this kind, Prof. Skydsgaard does not try to break fresh ground. There is only one criticism that I would like to make. After reading his

uncompromisingly honest description of contemporary Roman teaching in such matters as indulgences and Mariology, many readers, perhaps particularly in America, will find it difficult to share his conviction that "Christ is the living Lord also over the division," and that, therefore, "we are already one church" (15). This underscores once again the need for a thorough study of the way in which the Roman Church can be said to share the One Faith.

The next two books are written for a more restricted and expert audience. In many ways they contradict each other, yet both deserve careful attention. *Die Katholizität der Kirche* is a collection of ten essays, on different topics, written by eight German Lutherans who, despite varying viewpoints, are all trying to lay the groundwork for what, at least in Germany, is a fairly new understanding of the relation between the confessions. WILHELM STÄHLIN's essay (179-204) comes closest to stating the general thesis: "Catholicism and Protestantism are two forms of the apostasy from catholicity" (203). Each of them preserves truths which the other neglects, but, because of their negations, both distort the very truths which they seek to defend. Lutherans must abandon their anxious opposition to everything "Roman" and seek to appropriate the many genuinely Christian elements which the Roman Church has and we lack. In their Roman form, these elements are distorted, and so must be purified, altered and deepened. Yet the same holds true of our own distinctively Lutheran emphases. These also suffer from isolation and partiality and will gain their full significance only when brought into the *complexio oppositorum* (188) which is the wholeness of Christian faith and life.

It will be noticed that this is an approach, originally developed by Roman Catholic apologists, which is here being turned against its originators. It was Roman Catholics who first maintained that the truly catholic church is a *complexio oppositorum*, and that the errors of Protestantism are not in its positive affirmations, but in its oneness. This book, however, argues that the Roman Church is equally one-sided, is as "Protestant as Protestantism" (201), and that it cannot for a moment be confused with true catholicity. Stählin says of himself and his fellows "that we cannot become Roman precisely because we are catholic" (202). This, I think, is true, and should be remembered by those

who may fear that such men are on their way "back to Rome."

The approach of this book is also reminiscent of the Anglican "Middle Way," which reproaches both Romanism and Protestantism with one-sidedness and likes to consider itself an intermediate *complexio oppositorum*. The similarity emerges most clearly in three essays devoted to the order of the church and its offices (*Ämter*). In a brilliant but difficult essay (285-307), HANS DOMBOIS explains that, in the early church, law and visible unity were far more important than among modern Protestants but, unlike the Roman forms, these were "sacramental," rather than legal and juristic. HANS ASMUSSEN (237-284) and HEINZ-DIETRICH WENDLAND (205-236) argue for a proper combination in the church of equality and inequality, of pastoral and episcopal authority with the priesthood of all believers. Asmussen suggests that even the desirability of the apostolic episcopal succession must be seriously considered, even though it is not to be conceived juristically in such a way as to cast doubt on the validity of ministries which are not in the succession (280-283, 386-390).

The essays of ERNST KINDER on tradition (9-79), and of PETER MEINHOLD (133-160) and Hans Dombos (161-176) on history, state principles which can be used either for or against the retention or revival of particular practices. On the one hand, they emphasize the visible continuity of the church, and the importance of authority and tradition; but, on the other hand, they insist on historicity and on the fact that traditions may be perverse, or may become so when clung to despite historical changes. In short, what we have here are well-balanced statements based on much of the best recent thought in this area.

Thus E. Kinder is also on familiar ground when he argues that the rejection of tradition in favor of the *sola scriptura* cannot be maintained in its old form. The New Testament itself is a product of tradition, and our appropriation of this earliest record of the tradition is itself mediated through other, post-apostolic, developments. To deny all authority to these in the effort to establish an immediate relation to the revelatory events (as do liberalism, the sects and, I would add, Barth), is not to escape from tradition but rather to surrender to the *Zeitgeist*, i.e., to traditions so new that one is not aware of them as such. However, Kinder carries the analysis farther. Through tradition—e.g.,

dogma, theology, new forms of Christian action and devotion—our understanding of the revelatory events can be “widened, enriched, deepened, purified and clarified” (48). This approaches the Roman Catholic conception, although the latter speaks too much of “an organic growth and a successive unfolding” (76), and forgets that a tradition is to be judged not so much by its content as by its use in the service of the gospel (68). Nevertheless, the fundamental error of Rome lies, not in its view of tradition, but of the norm for distinguishing between false and true, bad and good, traditions. This norm must ultimately be the apostolic tradition as known through the New Testament, rather than the infallible teaching office of the church (75-77).

The true catholicity which will alone break through the old antitheses and fulfill the Reformation is sketched by K. B. RITTER in his discussion of the falseness of the opposition between “The Church of the Word and the Church of the Sacrament” (81-132). The mere fact that we think it possible to separate these shows that both Roman Catholics and Protestants have departed from the biblical understanding. The word of God is fundamentally “the *Logos* element in the Ground of Being” (quoted from P. Tillich, 82), it is God’s self-manifestation in all its forms, above all in Christ, but also in history and creation (98-100). It is an intellectualist misunderstanding to suppose that the word is chiefly spoken, or written, for the Bible speaks of the experience of God’s presence as often in terms of seeing, feeling, tasting, as of hearing (85). A corresponding intellectualism has perverted the understanding of the sacrament, and led to the raising of questions about the number of the sacraments (it is equally wrong to affirm that there are just seven, or just two), about their causality, and about the manner in which they communicate grace. In the usage of the New Testament, the sacrament (*mysterium*) is the name of the reality of God’s saving presence, first of all in Christ, and then also in the church and its members, and in the means through which Christ in his reality is communicated to believers so that they share in his death and resurrection, in his very being (113 ff.). In the early church, all ecclesiastical rites, as well as the entire life in Christ, were viewed as sacramental, and the sacramental was, in turn, proclamation; while the proclaimed word, in the

narrow sense of preaching, was understood as also sacramental. In order to regain this fullness of truth, we need to overcome “on the Roman side the hardening of the sacrament into thing-like objectivity, the loss of its *Logos* character, on the evangelical side, the loss of mystery and the victory of the spiritualistically interpreted word over the sacramental life in the church” (120).

In summary, then, we may say of this book that, however debatable some of the details, it does provide an eloquent statement of the fundamental task: we must strive to develop, in terms appropriate to our own day, the fullness and unity of Christian truth and life which now lies withered and divided between the different confessions.

The last book, *Skandalon*, by J. KLEIN, presents an approach which is the reverse of the usual Protestant one, for Prof. Klein, who teaches canon law at the University of Göttingen, is a convert from Roman Catholicism. The “no” to Rome is part of the blood and bone of most Protestants, so that they are often grateful and astonished when they discover that a partial “yes” is also possible. Prof. Klein, on the contrary, assumes the “yes,” and all his attention is concentrated on the “no” which he has discovered, at great personal cost, must also be said. Yet he has not forgotten the “yes.” He says that what is common to the Roman and evangelical conceptions of the Christian life is more important than what separates them, for “they are both grounded in the gospel, and both live from this most priceless of human goods” (419). Speaking of the importance of theological conversations across confessional lines, he writes that “They can above all serve the task of working out and positively representing the common substance of faith... not for the purpose of self-justification, but for the sake of the responsibility which we have before, and for, each other in our existence as Christians” (395-6).

However, it is easy to ignore such statements, both because they are infrequent and because they were written while Prof. Klein was moving towards, but had not yet made, an open break with Rome.

Actually the earlier essays on canon law (88-114), Roman juridical form (288-331), Thomistic ethics (332-365), casuistry (366-392), and Catholic and Protestant views of the Christian life (393-421) express Klein’s basic criticism of the Roman system more fully and clearly than do his later essays, for

these are largely complicated and technical controversies about the proper interpretation of canon law. The author mentions only one point at which he has changed his earlier critique: he used to believe that the fundamental fault of the church could be reformed, but now believes this is impossible (cf. 324, fn. 31), and that the only possibility left is revolution (cf. Intro. vi).

Put bluntly, this irreformable fault is the claim of the Roman Church that it has the right to force men to act against their consciences. It pretends to juridical, legal authority of the sort the state employs when it restrains even those who act on the basis of honestly held convictions from disturbing public order, or threatening national safety. The church may often be prevented from exercising such authority by other powers in society. It may even freely refrain from doing so. But, Prof. Klein asserts, what it cannot do without contradicting its institutional essence is to give up the claim that it has, in principal at least, the right to force consciences (122 f.). Klein makes a second, even more damning, assertion, which is logically independent of the first, but which he seems to consider a simple corollary: the church will, as a matter of fact, always try to put into effect this claimed right to force consciences whenever it has the opportunity to do so (e.g., 142).

The reason why this error on the nature of ecclesiastical authority is infinitely worse than the theological aberrations of the Marian dogmas or of infallibility is that, unlike these, it does not merely endanger the gospel, but contradicts it. The Catholic who fully knows and fully accepts the teaching of his church is committed to believing in the legitimacy of forcing men "to live a lie" (80) both by using the power of the state and the threat of public scandal in order to keep men in outward conformity to the church. That the pressure of public opinion is used in this way even in contemporary Germany Klein documents in a quite heart-rending manner, both from his own experience and from the experiences of others, including professors of theology, who out of fear have not broken with Rome (cf. esp. 1-88 *passim*).

However, this is less important than the question of whether the Roman Church is in fact irrevocably committed to using and justifying such methods. Klein's evidence is of three sorts. He analyses the juridical structure of the church and the fact that, on

the practical level, its influence on its members is exercised primarily through rationalistic, objective casuistic law which hinders the actualization of a genuinely Christian life of personal faith and love (esp. 366, 421). Second, this legalism, which is "the essential principle of Catholicism" (118), has led inevitably to the assertion in canon law of the right to use temporal coercion, including the arm of the state (139, 168), in matters of faith. The most extreme development of this is in the claim of jurisdiction, not only over believers, but over all the baptized, which allows for the imposition of external penalties for heresy (e.g., 71 f.), and for the forcible catholicization of the baptized children of non-Catholics (e.g., 155 ff.). In the third place, Klein replies to the criticism of his position by the Roman Catholic canonist Barion (39 ff., 153 ff.) by arguing that the latter fails to read canon law in the light of dogma. The claim to the right of using force was made by the Council of Trent (Denzinger 870, cf. 168), and is also present by implication in the Vatican Council assertion that "those who have accepted the faith under the teaching power of the church can never have a just cause (i.e., a cause, such as invincible ignorance, which would rule out the use of force against them) for changing our doubting that faith" (*qui sub Ecclesiae magisterio fidem susceperunt, nullam unquam habere possunt iustam causam mutandi aut in dubium fidem eandem revocandi*, Denzinger 1794, cf. 34). This cannot help but make genuine interconfessional discussion difficult (170 f.), for the Catholic participant is obligated to believe that doubt of his own position is a crime, immoral and rooted in sin, whereas the Protestant has the opposite duty. Loyalty to Christ demands that he doubt his own understanding of Christianity whenever the evidence against it seems weighty.

As we have already observed, Klein goes a step further and contends that the Roman Church must believe not only in the possibility, but in the desirability, of using force. That is, a situation in which the church is supported by the full power of the state is the thesis, the ideal, while approval of religious liberty is only a hypothesis, a concession to circumstances (157 ff.). This, however, is the least convincing part of his book for, while he can quote what is probably a majority of Roman Catholic authorities in support of this view, he is not aware of the impressive work which has been done, especially in

America by men like John Courtney Murray, S. J., in favor of the contrary position.

However, even if Prof. Klein at times exaggerates, even if he often sounds more angry than convincing, we are still greatly in his debt for having given us the most thorough and expert study yet written of a central point at which we must say "no" to Rome. However, as we have seen he also believes, we must be equally concerned to clarify and emphasize the partial "yes." His work makes even more urgent a balanced appraisal of both the strengths and weaknesses of Roman Catholicism, an appraisal which combines sympathy and severity as expertly as do Bouyer and van de Pol in their studies of Protestantism.

GEORGE A. LINDBECK

Theology and Pedagogy

New German Publications on Religious Education

DIE EVANGELISCHE UNTERWEISUNG AN HÖHEREN SCHULEN. By Helmut Angermeyer. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1957. 239 pp. DM 10.80.

CONFIRMATIO. *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Praxis der Konfirmation.* Ed. by Kurt Frör. Munich: Evang. Presseverband für Bayern, 1959. 202 pp. Paper bound DM 11.20, cloth DM 13.20.

ERZIEHUNG DURCH VERKÜNDIGUNG. *Pädagogische Forschungen.* Part 12. By Hermann Diem & Werner Loch. Publication of the Comenius-Institute. Heidelberg: Verlag Quelle & Meyer, 1959. 93 pp. Paper bound DM 6.80.

ERZIEHUNG UND BILDUNG IN DER MÜNDIGEN WELT. By Gerhardt Giese. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957. 198 pp. Cloth bound DM 12.80.

DIE EVANGELISCHE UNTERWEISUNG. *Quellen zur Unterrichtslehre.* Part 7. By Friedrich Hahn. Julius Beltz Verlagsbuchhandlung, Weinheim a. d. Bergstr., 1958. 188 pp. Paper bound DM 9.80.

DIE EVANGELISCHE UNTERWEISUNG IN DEN SCHULEN DES 16. JAHRHUNDERTS. *Pädagogische Forschungen.* Part 3. By Friedrich Hahn. Publications of the Comenius-Institute. Heidelberg: Verlag Quelle & Meyer, 1957. 136 pp. Paper bound DM 9.50.

DIE GRUNDFORMEN DES PÄDAGOGISCHEN VERSTEHENS. By Erich Hermann. Munich: Verlag Joh. Ambrosius Barth, 1959. 250 pp. Cloth bound DM 19.80.

VERKÜNDIGUNG UND ERZIEHUNG. *Über das Verhältnis von Theologie und Pädagogik.* By Gert Otto. Göttingen: Verlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957. 89 pp. Paper bound DM 7.80.

EVANGELISCHER RELIGIONSUNTERRICHT AN DER BERUFSSCHULE. *Fragen an Schule und Kirche.* By Gert Otto & Karl Witt. Göttingen: Verlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958. 79 pp. Paper bound DM 6.20.

RECHT UND GRENZEN EINER BERUFUNG AUF LUTHER IN DEN BEMÜHUNGEN UM DIE EVANGELISCHE ERZIEHUNG. By Edgar Reimers. Göttinger Studien zur pädagogik. New Series, part 5. Julius Beltz Verlagsbuchhandlung, Weinheim a. d. Bergstr. n. d. 175 pp. Paper bound DM 8.80.

CHRISTENTUM UND SCHULE. By Martin Stallmann. Stuttgart: Verlag Curt E. Schwab, 1958. 220 pp. Cloth bound DM 16.80.

STUDIEN ZUR AUSLEGUNG DER SYNOPTISCHEN EVANGELIEN IM UNTERRICHT. By Hans Stock. Gütersloh: Carl Bertelsmann Verlag, 1959. 254 pp. Cloth bound DM 16.80.

WIR UND UNSERE KINDER. *Eine Pädagogik der Altersstufen.* By Magdalene von Tiling. Stuttgart: J. F. Steinkopf. 2nd ed., 1956. 253 pp. Cloth bound DM 10.80.

DIE EIGENSTÄNDIGKEIT DER ERZIEHUNG IN THEORIE UND PRAXIS. *Probleme der akademischen Lehrerbildung.* By Erich Weniger. Julius Beltz Verlagsbuchhandlung, Weinheim a. d. Bergstr. n. d. 555 pp. Cloth bound DM 24.00.

KONFIRMANDENUNTERRICHT. *Neue Wege der Katechetik in Kirche und Schule.* By Karl Witt. Göttingen: Verlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959. 90 pp. Paper bound DM 4.80.

EVANGELISCHE UNTERWEISUNG UND INNERE SCHULREFORM. By Siegfried Wolf. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1959. 265 pp. DM 14.00.

There are three main points in the discussions in the area of religious pedagogy:

1. the basic question concerning the relationship between religion and education;
2. the political question of the relationship between Christianity and the school;
3. the didactic question concerning the possibilities of new forms for evangelical instruction.

1. On the pedagogical side in a basic discussion of the relationship between education and the proclamation of the gospel, the keywords "autonomy" and the "integrity of education" are of great importance. ERIC WENIGER, in his symposium which bears the title *Die Eigenständigkeit der Erziehung in Theorie und Praxis* has dealt with this theme in relationship to theology in a number of essays. It is merely a supposition when the theological side interprets the challenge of pedagogical autonomy to mean that educational activity must be protected against every influence of faith. Weniger much more explicitly maintains that in education "the end motive of faith is really realized as an effective and important force" (p. 96). For the sake of the impartiality of education every attempt to bind it to presuppositions which do not arise out of its own province, whether they be political or theological, must certainly be guarded against. The meaning of the proclamation of the gospel for education cannot be sought in the situation where all educational activity derives from theological principles; but faith is effective, that is, if it is so at all, when it is "incorporated into and worked into the existential event preceding education as an *a priori* phenomenon of human existence" (p. 152). In this manner pedagogy has defined the basis on which the discussion between theology and pedagogy concerning the question of the meaning of faith for education is to proceed.

The dissertation of EDGAR REIMERS on *Recht und Grenzen einer Berufung auf Luther in den Bemühungen um die evangelische Erziehung* deals with this question of the significance of faith for education within a particular framework. Reimers carefully and clearly traces the history of the basic discus-

sions of religious education since the new theological consciousness of the '20s which is characterized by the names of Bohne, Hammelsbeck, Kittel, Magdalene von Tiling and Frör, in order to raise the question of theological relevance. The standard for his judgment he attempts to draw from Luther, whom all of the above-mentioned authors also cited as their source. He is not concerned with proving individual statements with proof-texts from Luther, but wants to measure their basic intention against the basic intention of Luther's doctrine. He finds the core of Luther's teaching to be the distinction between law and gospel which is presented with extraordinary clarity in the Lectures on the letter to the Galatians of 1531. Reimers also seeks to understand Luther through the systematic core of his teachings. In his interpretation of Luther he relates himself closely to Gogarten who derived the fundamental *Entweltlichung* (in no way contingent upon this world) of the gospel and therewith of faith from the distinction between law and gospel. That which is worldly, that which is available belongs on the side of the law, and Luther's intention behind the distinction between law and gospel is to keep faith radically free from all earthly qualifications.

How is faith significant for the activity of the believer in this world? According to this interpretation, only in that it preserves his activity from all religious and ideological usurpation and thereby retains true objectivity. This is true also for education which makes no distinction between the acts of believers and those of non-believers as long as it remains free from ideological non-objectivity. Faith only has meaning in that it preserves the true worldliness and objectivity of the educator's activity. From this perspective Reimer can give whole-hearted support to all attempts to maintain the autonomy of pedagogy.

Here is just the point at which one must turn the question of the right to call upon Luther for support back to Reimers. This radical *Entweltlichung* of faith is certainly not in keeping with Luther's intention. This is clearly shown in the chapter which reports on Luther's thought concerning education. Here are statements of Luther which are directly opposed to the principle of *Entweltlichung*; thus it is again made clear that the statements of Luther cannot be systematically reduced to any common denominator. In this respect Reimers, from his perspective,

cannot do justice to Luther whose polarities serve to clarify basic issues and cannot be disposed of as remains of unsolved problems. The principle of separating faith from everything worldly does not correspond to Luther's intention, and the attempt to define the significance of faith for education in this sense must remain unsatisfactory.

The investigation of GERT OTTO *Verkündigung und Erziehung* goes much further. Otto undertakes a critique of the attempt of Hammelsbeck, Frör, Bohne and Uhsadle to give education a theological foundation. When one acknowledges the "integrity of education" one must conclude:

... every attempt of this kind is bound to failure because in the last analysis education is not capable of being so founded because of its very nature. A worldly phenomenon such as education evades all rational, all theological bases; our task is exactly the opposite, to understand it in its *a priori* character and from there to master it instead of trying to give it a foundation after having examined it to the roots (p. 47 ff.).

For the Christian the understanding of the educational situation is strongly determined by his faith, just as is his understanding of the world. At the same time such an understanding is the original task of pedagogy. The degree to which faith is determinative for pedagogical thought and practice becomes evident here. But this connection does not suggest that pedagogical principles can be simply derived from theological presuppositions; instead faith is active in the carrying out of hermeneutics, in the act of understanding and accomplishing. Certainly, in all of this the eschatological character of the proclamation dare not be overlooked—as Otto also emphasizes—by which it causes a crisis in all human activity in this world.

In the light of this position, an "evangelical pedagogy" in the old style is no longer possible. Should not an attempt be made, however, to describe concretely how the actual educational situation is understood from the standpoint of Christian faith and to show how this differs from a "purely" pedagogical approach? Otto makes one attempt at it (see pp. 69 ff.), which, however, is not very satisfying, because what he calls the uniqueness of Christian education could also be claimed by the non-Christian educator. It is obviously not possible by means of a definition to separate the Christian from the non-Christian in the concrete situation, because every such attempt

is basically a falling back upon that form of argumentation from theological presuppositions which belies the integrity of pedagogy.

In this connection the book by MAGDALENE VON TILING *Wir und unsere Kinder* is interesting. It occupies itself with the search for a systematics of pedagogy which is not determined by philosophy, theology or psychology (see p. 7). This goal is all the more surprising because the author allows herself to be influenced to a large extent by theological observations; but this does not happen in the sense of beginning with theological presuppositions, rather the theological arguments arise in the course of the pedagogical deliberations. In this respect the book is an instructive example of how pedagogy in its actuality looks from the standpoint of the Christian.

Magdalene von Tiling finds the basis for an independent systematic pedagogy in the acknowledgement that the course of human development can very plainly be divided into different age groups, because all pedagogical activity presupposes an interchange between elders and youth. There is some doubt whether this is an adequate basis for a pedagogical system, but the book is nevertheless impressive for the extraordinary perceptivity with which the individual age-groups are understood. It is not a psychological presentation, but is developed anthropologically with reference to pedagogy. How much it differs from a psychological approach is evident by the observations on the faith of children which could never be analyzed in such a relevant manner by means of psychology.

If our discussion so far has revolved around the question of the significance of being Christian for the activity of the educator, the investigation of HERMANN DIEM and WERNER LOCH *Erziehung durch Verkündigung* raises the counter-question, what meaning does education have for being Christian, that is, "to what extent does the Christian educate through his witness" (p. 28.). Here is shown how genuine pedagogical relationships have their legitimate place in the act of proclaiming the gospel just as in teaching, the transmitting of tradition, and the training of followers. The processes of transmitting and teaching as phenomena are investigated in detail from the perspective of pedagogy. To be sure the analysis is unsatisfactory because it overlooks the importance of the fact of explanation (of understanding). When the hermeneutic problem is taken into account the

relationship between teaching and the transmission of tradition takes on a different aspect. On the whole, however, this presentation proves to be very fruitful for further theological reflections concerning teaching and tradition, and it is particularly stimulating to the theologian since theology in the last century energetically barred its doors to the infiltration of pedagogical insights into its central area of concern. But this defense was erected against a picture of pedagogy which has long since been superseded and hence can no longer be justified.

In the light of this presentation of the question the phenomenological investigation of pedagogy by ERICH HERMANN *Die Grundformen des pädagogischen Verstehens* is also significant for theology, precisely because its object, the understanding, also plays an important role in the realm of theology. The author seeks, above all, to emphasize how important a direct "co-existential" understanding is which arises out of the general course of life and does not make that with which it is concerned into an object of conscious reflection as does the objectifying understanding of things and of persons. It is obvious that without such a "mutual understanding" no pedagogical course is possible. The question must be raised whether there is really a basic type of understanding involved here which exists alongside of that which objectifies or whether the direct, non-reflective form of understanding is not merely the basic form of all understanding from which all reflections emanate and to which they all return.

2. The discussion concerning the fundamental principles involved in both proclamation and education becomes concrete in the consideration of the relationship between Christianity and the school. This is the real theme of the publication by GERHARDT GIESE, *Erziehung und Bildung in der mündigen Welt*. It deals particularly with the form of the evangelical school. In sharp contrast to the demand of Herbart for teaching which indoctrinates (that is, training in a particular way of thinking) the point is here made that the nature of the evangelical school in no way requires the kind of instruction whereby every subject is infused with confessional viewpoints. The author does not intend to set himself up as the champion of a particular evangelical confessional school but feels the urgent need to contend against a state monopoly in education. For this reason the

existence of evangelical schools is necessary. What is said here about the relationship between the gospel and education is, however, inadequate.

In this connection the dissertation of SIEGFRIED WOLF, *Evangelische Unterweisung und innere Schulreform* must be mentioned, although the title leads one to expect that it deals with the didactic problem of evangelical instruction. But Wolf does not restrict himself to the question which new methods of evangelical instruction could be taken over by a reform of pedagogy; instead he takes a critical stand as theologian to the inner attempts at school reform.

This very inclusive investigation, in which almost all of the basic questions involved in evangelical instruction are dealt with, must be criticized because it fails to take pedagogy seriously as a partner to the discussion although the need to do so is continually being reiterated in the book. The theological method of the author apparently prevents him from doing so. Again and again he argues from theological presuppositions which pedagogy cannot accept as appropriate to the discussion. The task of religious pedagogy in the discussion of the place of evangelical instruction in the total school pattern he sees as "the need to give a theological foundation for the right of religious instruction to exist in the schools" (p. 62). What is overlooked here is that the contemporary school, out of its own understanding of itself, acknowledges that evangelical instruction belongs to her total structure, and this is the only valid basis for its existence in the school, not contemporary theological presuppositions. Should the critique of school reforms proceed in such a manner that "religious pedagogy enters into the present struggle to discover the correct form of school by contributing to the discussion conclusions arising out of its own presuppositions" then the integrity of pedagogy, which can only acknowledge as relevant those arguments arising out of her own province and not those deriving from theological presuppositions, will be denied.

In MARTIN STALLMANN's book *Christentum und Schule* the inclusion of religious instruction in the total school program is seen from the standpoint of the task of the school itself. The task of the school is to interpret the tradition, necessitated by the fact that in our age the traditions no longer possess unquestioned validity but must be interpreted.

The tradition of the church of necessity belongs to the total tradition, and the school, if it wishes to remain relevant, cannot ignore the Christian tradition.

3. The problem now is: How is religious instruction to be regarded in the light of all this? Stallmann is also very much influenced by the theology of Gogarten in which the gospel (the proclamation, the word) and faith must be radically differentiated from all that which is worldly and at one's disposal; all of this belongs on the side of the law, as does also the tradition, "Christendom." In this sense Stallmann maintains that religious instruction is not proclamation and dare not attempt to be; the proclamation is the content of preaching, the task of instruction by contrast is to interpret, which belongs fundamentally to the realm of the law—it can lead us to the conviction that our existence is corrupt—but only preaching can transmit the forgiving word of God to us.

But still it is not possible to limit interpretation to the realm of the law. The gospel cannot be eliminated from the realm of interpretation, that is, from the realm of teaching for the sake of the principle of its *Entweltlichung*. Furthermore this contrast between the non-practical quality of the gospel and the methodical nature of interpretation betrays an all too rationalistic conception of interpretation. If interpretation fully intends to lead to understanding and not merely to the positing of a certain intellectual content, then this result (with biblical as well as with other texts) is never subject to manipulation.

All of these observations center around the question of the meaning of faith for religious instruction. This theme was taken up by Weniger in the above-mentioned compendium *Glaube, Unglaube, und Erziehung* from the perspective of the religion teacher from whom it cannot always be expected that he be a believing Christian. Weniger suggests here a hermeneutic-illustrative instruction, which, in as relevant a manner as possible, tries to make the self-understanding of the Christian community clear through the interpretation of biblical texts. Weniger believes this to be possible without presupposing faith, though certainly the personal existential confrontation of the individual being instructed with the subject being studied (in this case the gospel), which is presupposed in every form of enlightened instruction, is necessary. According to this, faith—again in the sense

of Gogarten—lies on an entirely different level than does the existential confrontation with the gospel. We must again raise the question whether this differentiation between faith and existential understanding does justice to the subject.

Stock also places the conception of interpretation at the center of his theory on instruction in his *Studien zur Auslegung der synoptischen Evangelien im Unterricht* but he obviously understands it quite differently than does Stallmann. When he writes: "The interpretation of texts in religious instruction has its goal to make the original claim of the gospel understandable by explaining the historical factual elements of the proclamation" he shows that for him proclamation and interpretation and faith and understanding are not so far apart from one another.

Stock's book is dedicated to the task of making the results of modern theological research fruitful for religious instruction, especially the work on form criticism of the Gospels. Through the insight into the kerygmatic character of the gospel pericopes, all interpretations face the problem of the relationship between faith and history. Stock refers often to the "real unity of historical memory and revealed understanding which is evident to reflection" (p. 53), but this is no harmonious unity, rather a "synthesis rich with tensions" (p. 42). The more one digs into this tension, the deeper the meaning of the text. In this sense Stock formulates his "didactic principle": the dialectic in the relationship between the historical and the eschatological which constitute Christian faith must come into play, so that the history of Jesus and the witness to him in the gospels are in principle differentiated from one another in order to be understood in their historically conditioned combination in the gospels as well as in the togetherness of their content (p. 42). This passage shows clearly that Stock, as he himself admits, drafts his conceptions on the basis of instruction in the higher grades. This method of developing the dialectic from beginning to end in instruction is above all vulnerable because it completely ignores the problem of elementary education, the attempt to present an approach to the subject at every age level.

After the short section on basic principles, there are interpretations of seven pericopes which are complete with didactic questions and sketches of class sessions with accompanying critical remarks. This interpretation

offers an excellent introduction in methods because here finished results are not reported; instead the reader is compelled to work his own way through the whole exegetical work even down to the didactic observations. In this manner basic theological questions are developed out of the material itself and are presented as examples.

HELMUT ANGERMEYER treats the entire field of evangelical instruction in a manner which combines careful theological observation with many methodological references. If the reader remains somewhat dissatisfied at the end, it is because of the method of the presentation, which first deals with basic questions of principle and their realization, and then goes on to practical questions which seem to be more or less appendages and consequences of the basic observations. They are, therefore, not always clearly formulated. Angermeyer criticizes the common practice of "application" of biblical texts as illustrations, "symbols" of didactic statements, overlooking the fact that the very same manner of thought underlies the work on the *Skopus* of the biblical texts, and deserves also to be criticized here. It would have been more in keeping with the context had the attack been made not on basic theological observations, but there where the theological and the methodological meet, namely, the question of hermeneutics.

Precisely this happens in a little book by KARL WITT on confirmation instruction. Here methodological questions such as that of "application" and the use of texts as examples are theologically thought through and on the other hand, theological questions such as that of the understanding of the catechism are seen in terms of their significance for the methods used in teaching. The new conception of confirmation instruction which is here presented is the result of reflections concerning the relationship between Luther's Small Catechism and the Holy Scriptures. Here is shown how theological principles which can no longer be supported play a role in the customary type of confirmation instruction. The catechism cannot be separated from the course of interpreting the Scriptures; its legitimate place is discovered in the act of interpreting the Scriptures, moving back and forth in the hermeneutic circle between the Bible and the catechism. Thus the catechism cannot be properly interpreted apart from its use in the interpretation of Scripture, consequently the instruction itself must deal so thoroughly

with the biblical texts that the catechism is understood and in turn aids in the interpretation of other biblical pericopes.

Of special interest in this connection is the newly developed insight into the practice of memory work which has always been a thorn in the flesh in confirmation instruction. Witt sees memory work as an individual way of unlocking the text; for with a text which is well-translated the way can lead past its grammatical form to a much deeper understanding through the practice of discussing it in confirmation instruction. Even these deductions about the practice of memorizing must be seen in the light of the basic question concerning the proper interpretation of Scripture. With this concentration on the hermeneutic problem, in which connection theological questions are methodologically relevant and methodological questions gain theological relevancy, a new manner of reflection concerning confirmation instruction is exercised which takes seriously the place of theological thought for the interpretation of Scriptural texts in the area of instruction. This book has wide consequences far beyond the narrow confines of confirmation instruction.

It is not possible here to go into the many-sided problematic of confirmation. Whoever desires a glance at the contemporary situation may well reach for the anthology of KURT FRÖR, *Confirmatio—Forschungen zur Geschichte und Praxis der Konfirmation*. In a series of contributions by various authors, the history of confirmation is first dealt with, then the basic theological questions, a few individual questions (the nature of the vow and the proper age for confirmation) and finally a new liturgical order for confirmation and confirmation instruction. This anthology is a product of a conference on the subject initiated by the Lutheran World Federation in preparation for an international seminar on confirmation and confirmation instruction.

Light is thrown upon the history of evangelical education by the study of FRIEDRICH HAHN, *Evangelische Unterweisung an den Schulen des 16. Jahrhunderts*. This treatment of the historical background and the times in which Luther's statements about instruction were made give one a standard by which to measure the various positions on individual questions concerning evangelical education which claim to be based on Luther. Despite the oft-repeated claim that the basic questions in that day were the same ones which are

acute in ours, one has the feeling that there is a big historical gulf between the pedagogy of Luther's day and ours.

An anthology of sources took shape out of the preliminary investigations for the above study which Hahn has published under the title *Evangelische Unterweisung* in the series *Quellen zur Unterrichtslehre*. It contains sources ranging from Luther and Melancthon to Bohn, Heckel, Burkert, Kittel, Hammelsbeck and Frör. One would have wished that the last 30 years would have been better represented, but this would have been beyond possibility in such an anthology of sources.

In conclusion, attention must be called to a relatively young branch of evangelical education, for which a whole new style of instruction has been developed, namely, religious instruction in the trade schools. Instruction must take an entirely different form here, corresponding to the special situation of working youth, than it does in confirmation or in institutions of higher learning. If it does justice to its purpose, it cannot ignore the vital questions which are asked with great intensity by those beginning in their trades. This task demands special theological and pedagogical considerations. Gert Otto and Karl Witt have raised these questions in a work which they have published together *Evangelischer Unterricht an der Berufsschule—Fragen an Schule und Kirche*. Behind the statement "Religious instruction in the trade schools seeks to give young people practical help for living through the inspiration and illumination which biblical texts can bring to their questions" (p. 31) stands the conviction that the vital questions are directly related to faith and to the Biblical insights, so that being occupied with them is no "preparatory" work. In this sense, Bonhoeffer had already stressed the "this-worldliness" of genuine faith and had opposed with great sharpness all attempts to separate the sphere of religion from that of daily life.

The object of this instruction is not to offer biblical quotations as pat answers for vital questions; instead, if real clarification is to result, the one being instructed must seek to so thoroughly understand the biblical texts that their significance becomes apparent in terms of his own daily life. All attempts to superficially force a biblical understanding make the instruction unbelievable. Where the instruction seeks to fulfill its task in a relevant manner, "non-religious proclamation," such as that called for by Bonhoeffer results; and

when this is done in one place such as a trade school it serves as a significant example for the whole of the church.

INGO BALDERMANN

The Church and Social Ethics

THEOLOGISCHE ETHIK. Vol. II *Entfaltung. Part 2 Ethik des Politischen*. By Helmut Thielicke. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1959. XXIV and 787 pp.

ETHIK. By Wolfgang Trillhaas. Berlin W: Alfred Töpelmann, 1959. XVI and 464 pp.

KIRCHE IM NEULAND DER INDUSTRIE. By Hans Storck. Berlin: Käthe Vogt Verlag, 1959. 189 pp.

What form should a Christian ethic for the 20th century take? Can it—in our complicated world, which in contrast to other ages faces a completely new problematic—merely take biblical passages as its starting-point and seek to apply them to the modern formulation of the questions? The traditional evangelical ethic has scarcely ever earnestly raised the question whether the New Testament exhortations are not conditioned by their times, in that they presuppose a very particular external milieu, for example, the contemporary political, social and economic relationships. Other forms of evangelical ethics have other weaknesses. Without considering the real significance of the Reformation principle concerning the Scriptures, many writers of ethics work from the idea that the Bible is the once for all time revealed will of God in regard to questions of social ethics as well. In other words, the Bible becomes a legal code or a cookbook in which the recipe for the good Christian society is presented. Since both the Old and the New Testaments reflect a picture of a society and of social relationships of an era long past, the strangest situations result when one attempts to take it as a pattern, such as the instance where a Christian state must either maintain or introduce the death penalty—as Walter Künneth in *Politik zwischen Dämon und Gott*, 1954—or where the principle of the right to own property in modern industry is considered to be in conflict with the basic human rights given in the creation (see Rufus Cornelsen in an article in the anthology

Christian Social Responsibility in connection with the Lutheran World Federation Assembly in Minneapolis, 1957). Such methods are unsuitable for various reasons. One cannot read the Bible as a legal code; it is the witness to Christ. In the proclamation of Jesus one is confronted step by step with the concept of God as the continually active God. The creative work of God continues and even though the new creation is constantly threatened by evil and demonic forces it cannot be measured by regulations which were given to Israel at a particular stage in the history of salvation. How unsuitable it is to pick out a few biblical phrases as patterns for the solution of contemporary problems becomes evident as soon as one begins to take the present problems seriously. There are many questions for which the Bible has no direct answers. If these questions are to be discussed at all within the realm of a theological ethic, a completely different effort must be undertaken.

HELMUT THIELICKE has understood this better than most of the others. In his *Ethik des Politischen* the intentions of his mammoth work *Theologische Ethik* find much better expression than in the first volume. With this new work Thielicke has without doubt become one of the most important authors in the area of Christian social ethics. He begins his investigation with a short statement of basic principles which, in an interesting and pioneer manner, can lead to a renewal of ethics.

Thielicke does not completely reject the method which consists of "beginning with quotations from the Scriptures, the confessional books and other authoritative writings, interpreting them, and then trying to discover in the very interpretation the relevance between then and now (p. 3). The reviewer would have welcomed it if Thielicke had gone a step further at this decisive point, for even when it is carefully undertaken, this kind of approach easily leads to a most questionable conservatism in the area of social ethics. Thielicke himself takes a completely different path so that this criticism does not apply to him at all. He describes his approach in this manner:

The method of referring back can secondly take a more indirect and at the same time more discreet form: namely, that the theological thinker, knowing what he has behind him, and directed in his questioning by this knowledge, explores fully the problems of the contemporary situation and then refers them back in an express form later.

Thielicke also says that the way must be left free and open, because former methods often prove themselves inadequate in the area of social ethics. This is particularly true in connection with modern democracies. Just from the principle of methodology itself, it is particularly important to know just what the person concerned with ethics means by this "knowledge of that which lies behind him." A number of biblical-theological decisions are hidden behind this short formula. A portion of the problematic which belongs here has been handled by Thielicke in an earlier section of his work. In general, in the opinion of this reviewer, Thielicke is strongest in his analysis of the contemporary situation. The conclusions at which Thielicke arrives could, methodologically speaking, have been somewhat clearer had the author written one basic chapter on the criteria for social ethics with which he works and which he justly feels can be substantiated by the message of the New Testament. Involved are the criteria that deal with the fact that man must live a responsible life in relationship to God and his fellowmen, and that society, in particular the state, has a responsibility to look after the well-being of its citizens, etc. The perceptive reader can find such criteria between the lines, and even though they are not explicitly recorded in the text it is obvious that Thielicke proceeds on the basis of them. In this manner the "that which he has behind him" must be understood.

Thielicke's book has four main sections. The first (A) he calls "the modern manner of stating the question concerning a political ethics" (pp. 5-175). After a short presentation of methods, which was already referred to, he deals with "three circles of actual questions" which are of great importance. First he describes and discusses the "change from authoritarian to democratic ways of thinking." Here he maintains two things: "1) man has no power or authority to dispose of government as he likes, since it is instituted by God; 2) a variety of forms of states is, nevertheless, available." According to this, our task is to explicitly interpret Luther's concept of authority, which among others, goes back to the complete New Testament understanding of the state found in Rom. 13:1-7. The task is to rework it in order to set it free from the patriarchal order of the 16th century. Secondly, Thielicke presents questions dealing with the problem of the "totalitarian state" which are of special significance

for German readers. The ideologies, such as National Socialism and Communism, are critically judged; as Thielicke states they have "the theological quality of service to idols" (see p. 66 and the motives which are stated on the following pages). The third large and acute complex of questions deals with "the change from the authoritarian concept to that of a system which posits its own laws." Here economic questions are dealt with such as the law of supply and demand, among others, along with perspectives on the role which the development of the armaments industry plays in the origin of wars. Through the analysis of two model situations—Bismark and Hitler—Thielicke finds it possible to present his position over against the doctrine of orders which posit their own laws, i.e. against the idea of *Eingengesetzlichkeit*. He asks the question: "Is it possible to have something of an indirect radiation of the Christian position into the realm of objective programs when there are no direct objective directives in the Christian faith?" (p. 121). Thielicke answers as follows: the Christian statesman has the possibility of being concrete because he does not have to strive after any form of self-justification nor after ideals and ideologies with which to influence politics, the law and the whole culture (see particularly p. 127). Faith can also acquire "something of an active interventive meaning" in the form of a "moderation," a concept which corresponds to the Lutheran expression "equity." Faith can also hinder the doing of things merely for purposes of prestige. Thielicke's train of thought is contained *in nuce* in the following sentence: "only the redemption from servitude makes one free, that is, objective" (p. 133). Furthermore, says Thielicke, the Sermon on the Mount has a disturbing effect which questions the validity of all pseudo-solutions and of *laissez-faire*-politics. In all of this, faith seems to have more of the characteristic of a brake than an accelerating motor (p. 137). The author also means, and rightly, that faith can have the effect of a motor in that it sets new goals "such as the preservation of human personality amid the materialistic-organizational apparatus" (p. 138). In this connection, the reviewer missed a discussion on the problematic of the welfare state. It should have been brought to attention that the Christian spirit works and must work in the direction of a common program which knows itself responsible for the welfare and

development of the individual. Thielicke deals with the welfare state in other places as we shall see, and there rather critically! The problem which comes to light here is whether the picture of man in the New Testament, presented in preaching and practiced in the deeds of love without regard to race, sex, social position, talent and so forth, does not found an ethics in its trail which has a tendency to effect the whole of society. Luther spoke of *justitia fluens ex fide* or *justitia actualis*. This, then, may become an ethical principle which influences the legal codes of society. That the gospel has such power in respect to social ethics even outside the confines of the church is evident, according to some missionaries, for example, in India today.

The second main section bears the title: "The Question of the Nature of the State" (p. 176-398). Here Thielicke posits various viewpoints concerning the relationship of power and right. A special section deals with the biblical concept of the state (pp. 288-313). Against the background of the German situation the question of "the pedagogical competition between church and state" (p. 327 ff.) and the rights of parents are dealt with according to theological perspectives. Another section (p. 357 ff.) deals with the welfare state. In an interesting analysis, Thielicke concludes here that the material concern for mankind is threatened over a long period of time by the continually growing process of nationalization and bureaucracy. He maintains the noteworthy yet highly disputable thesis that the so-called "teen-age riots" (*Halbstarken-Krawallen*) constitute a reaction against a perfectionist society from which every material concern is removed and in which personal responsibility has been taken away from the individual (p. 382). Thielicke is in no way basically opposed to the welfare state, but he maintains:

Here also the state must exercise a minimum amount of governmental-control. Especially in the area of concern for people many tasks should be delegated to non-governmental agencies whose initiative should be allowed full play. At least the state should take as indirect a role as possible (pp. 385 ff.).

The third main section is called "Limitations of the State" (p. 399-669). Here two very large problem complexes are considered: "Opposition to the state" and "War." Thielicke supports the right to oppose a totalitarian state but cautions that in practice the opposition cannot take the form of an absolute refusal to obey any higher authority as such

or the form of an attempt to overthrow the government by force (see pp. 441 ff. for a systematic presentation of the perspectives involved in opposition). In the large chapter on war and peace, Thielicke states his already well-known views on atomic weapons, the balance of terror, and the so-called *pax atomica*. The limits of this review do not allow a detailed discussion of these views.

In the concluding section "The Relationship between Church and State" Thielicke describes and analyses the Roman Catholic (pp. 670-698) and the Reformed (pp. 699-756) positions on church and state. Of particular interest are his comments on Calvin. He says in summary: (pp. 725 ff.)

Almost everything which Calvin said about the changing forms of law and about the difference between motive and form in law, could just as well have been said by Luther. If one still insists that definite theocratic tendencies can be traced in the thought of Calvin then they must be found elsewhere. Thus, one cannot take the legalism of Calvin and turn it into a caricature, but must seek to understand it as a complex and many-sided structure.

According to this reviewer Thielicke has with this book made the most important contribution to contemporary Christian social ethics in many a year.

The *Ethik* of WOLFGANG TRILLHAAS is written in a very different manner. According to the foreword it is meant to be a textbook and an "introduction into the classic questions and answers." To be sure Trillhaas has changed over from practical to systematic theology but still he has not succeeded, at least not in this work, in giving his presentation a systematic form. The reader who is particularly concerned with modern questions will be disappointed if he expects to find any answers or clarity in Trillhaas' book. His concrete decisions are colored by a rather strong legalism and in the opinion of this reviewer his method is so unclear that it gives rise to contradictory principles.

The point of departure seems to be well enough taken in itself. In the Introduction (pp. 1-17), Trillhaas refrains from binding his presentation to one or more biblical proof-texts and rules in the light of which all actual decisions are to be made once and for all time.

At the beginning of all ethics stands the analysis of the human situation, the problem of our existence.... Being Christian, however we may understand it, is no principle out of which we can and dare construct reality... (p. 6).

This fundamental statement does not mean very much, however, as Trillhaas elsewhere says that faith must shed light upon our entire puzzling existence. For this, in itself correct perspective, is then interpreted in such a manner in the considerations which follow that he, point for point, attempts to reinforce his conclusions with corresponding biblical texts. In the section on basic principles, he talks in a general way about creation, sin, law, salvation, etc. (I, pp. 18-104). Trillhaas' concept of the law is very controversial. The section "The Law of Creation and the Revealed Law" shows that Trillhaas in no way comes close to the Lutheran conception of natural law. Consequently he sees the law given in the Bible as the true revelation of the law. Trillhaas says;

The inner order of God's creation... we call the law. By this we mean the order by which the world is preserved in a general sense. The perceptive spirit glimpses something of the form of this law step by step but in general it cannot be maintained that man either knows something about this law or follows it. It is an open question just how much this order of preservation has to do with the law which is written on the hearts of men (p. 29).

Therewith Trillhaas is compelled to turn to the revealed law in the Scriptures and its interpretation in preaching.

God has entrusted his revealed law to the preaching ministry, not only so that it becomes known in an external "kerygmatic" sense, but in order that it might be interpreted, that is, to the preaching ministry is given the responsibility to see that it is laid upon the heart (p. 34 ff.).

This reviewer must decidedly oppose any such basis for the Christian ethic which makes it something of an extended revelation of the law ("The preaching of the law is the elongation of the revelation of the law" p. 29). An evangelical ethic has two levels, the level of the law and that of the gospel. As to the law, one dare not, if one intends to follow Luther and that which he held as essential in the biblical message, bind it absolutely to the letters of the Bible and their interpretation. The result would be a very conservative ethic, especially as far as social ethics are concerned, for the law in the Bible reflects a very old-fashioned social order. It is typical that Trillhaas defends the death penalty along with K nneth, and he does so merely by quoting Gen. 9:6 and Rom. 13:4 (see p. 176). In the opinion of this reviewer, the worst way to write a social ethics is to read the Bible

in such a subjective and inept manner as to lift out particular passages as proof-texts. The restrictions which Trillhaas now and again places upon the legitimacy of using the Bible in this manner serve to do nothing but confuse the reader. If the law really is revealed in the Bible and nowhere else, why should we not take all the commands seriously?

Even the arrangement of the material leaves much to be desired. The discussion of the problem of the death penalty is placed in the section on "Ethics of the Person" (II, pp. 105-242); instead of being where it naturally belongs in the section on church and state, a chapter which really should be found in the third section of the book "Ethics of Society" (pp. 243-449). Instead, this section contains a chapter on "love and marriage" (pp. 257 ff.), in which one finds a discussion on the performing of marriages for divorced persons. Here Trillhaas calls upon the discipline of the church and emphasizes that I Cor. 7:10 ff. implies the necessity to refuse the recognition and blessing of the church to a second marriage during the life span of one of the divorced partners to the previous marriage (pp. 265 ff., 269). Quite apart from the fact that Trillhaas' categorical judgment on this subject is rather unique, one wonders why the problem of church discipline, if it belongs in a book on ethics at all, was not taken up in the section which bears the title "The Church on Earth" (pp. 415 ff.)

From what has been said it is obvious that this reviewer is very critical of Trillhaas' *Ethik*. In the opinion of the reviewer it will not make an important contribution to the field of contemporary evangelical ethics. Trillhaas mentions a great deal of literature in his book, but he hardly ever contrasts his views to those of others on the subject. This is too bad; had he done so he would have been forced to think through his entire position in a different manner.

Lutheran social ethics in Europe have always been very conservative. Because of this the church stood at the beginning of the process of industrialization, estranged from both the worker and the labor movement, to say nothing of Socialism. It is an obvious fact that the church in the last few decades has become more and more bourgeois so that it now stands closest to the so-called middle-class.

HANS STORCK is director of the Evangelical Academy in Friedewald. His book represents the search for a way out of the church's

isolation. From his observation of modern industrial society he has reached the conviction that it is the church's duty to evangelize and to bring the gospel to all classes of society. The question with which he deals is this: Where has industrialization provided new points of departure for the building up of evangelical congregations and groups (p. 9)? Storck's book "attempts to be a contribution to the clarification of the situation in which people and the church find themselves today" (p. 10).

Storck begins with an analysis of "the results and consequences of industrialization" (a vital and basic chapter, pp. 12-32). He remarks among other things: "Industry possesses a unique power to so influence the younger generation that they no longer feel at home in the congregation" (p. 16). In fact, "the broad field of daily life has become lost to the church" (p. 19). Even the sociological combination in our youth groups, Bible-study groups, etc. no longer really represents the main body of the population. This often persuades the pastor "only to deal with those problems which those present face before they come into contact with the industrial world" (p. 21). In this way the church runs the risk of living in a form of ghetto.

The pastor must come out of this isolation. The proclamation of the church must be changed, that is, naturally not its content but the manner in which it is presented, its vocabulary, etc. We can hardly appreciate how "old-fashioned, sentimental, and stilted" the traditional language of the sermon sounds to many ears. Already through its language the church appears as something strange. The pastor must, according to Storck, acquaint himself with the world of technics and sports and take his illustrations from daily life.

By doing this nothing genuinely Christian will be given up. "The proclamation of the gospel is something else than the handing down of staid theological formulas (p. 24). When one thoroughly studies "the New Testament understanding of mission" (this is the title of one of the chapters, pp. 33-50), then there can be no question but that the gospel must reach into every culture, transforming it from the inside. Paul was a Jew to the Jews and a Greek to the Greeks. If the people are to understand the church when she speaks, then she must remove all obstacles such as her sacred speech, for example.

In a row of chapters, Storck analyses the modern industrial world and the problems

which arise in the communal life of people through this changed situation. He reports that around 20 per cent of the West German population is engaged in some kind of work on Sundays. Doesn't this imply that the church must change the traditional pattern of Sunday services of worship into some more relevant form? The church should take more cognizance of the free Sunday and vacation periods, since this period is the high point of the year for many. Storck says:

It is a fact of common knowledge that the person estranged from the church is often much more receptive to the gospel during times of rest than he is in the one-hour service of worship which is held 52 times a year on Sunday morning (p. 65).

The local congregation must also be courageous enough to think through the old forms of congregational activity. Storck posits the bold thesis that "the life span of the average group is seldom longer than five years at the most" (p. 103). "In this period of time all combinations and constellations of interpersonal exchange in groups have run their course. Thereafter exhaustion and lethargy set in."

The church must develop a new strategy. In every modern collective there are a number of "secret counselors," persons who are very much respected and trusted. If these can be won over, whole groups often come with them. On the other hand, such tactical maneuvers cannot be overdone. The actual question is this: What does the gospel have to offer the individual group? Above all else the answer is: the forgiveness of sins! For this a new and deeper fellowship is necessary. For this very reason the church must be at liberty to experiment, that is, must have the freedom to work with new congregational forms and with small groups centered around a common type of work, common interests or something along this line.

Storck makes many concrete suggestions, but emphasizes also that his book is not intended as a form of cookbook filled with recipes. His main concern is to get theologians and pastors to think again about the problem of evangelization. Where this happens everyone in his own position can draw the necessary consequences and develop the necessary forms. What Storck says about the situation in his own country undoubtedly holds true for other lands as well:

The historically conditioned connection with the bourgeoisie makes it extremely difficult for the Evangelical Church in Germany to enter into a meaningful relationship with those who have been influenced and standardized by the new centers of integration in their work. Therefore there is hardly a more profitable activity for young theologians than to become actually engaged in the life situations of those who live and work in industry (p. 158).

If we take Storck seriously, we shall need a completely new social ethic and perhaps a new theological orientation. Storck appears to be extremely critical of the traditional theology:

One cannot escape the impression that what is essentially involved here is the necessity of theology to think again about her entire tradition and spiritual history. What is missing is a direct confrontation with the reality of the industrial world (p. 85).

Storck himself gives few solutions which are generally applicable, but he has in a stimulating manner raised the questions which those engaged in theological research and those in the practising ministry should have intensively dealt with a long time ago. *Kirche im Neuland der Industrie* should be read and studied by every pastor and student of theology.

GUNNAR HILLERDAL

The Century of the Lexikon

DIE RELIGION IN GESCHICHTE UND GEGENWART. *Third completely new edition. In cooperation with Hans Frhr. v. Campenhausen, Erich Dinkler, Gerhard Gloege and Knud E. Logstrup; edited by Kurt Galling.—Vol. I (A-C) 1957, 30 and 1898; Vol. II (D-G) 1958, XXXI p. and 1924; Vol. III (Sections 55 to 58, 1959). J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen.*

LEXIKON FÜR THEOLOGIE UND KIRCHE. *Founded by Dr. Michael Buchberger. Second completely new edition. Under the imprimatur of Archbishop Dr. Michael Buchberger and Archbishop Dr. Eugen Seierich. Edited by Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner. Volume I (A-Baronius) 1957, 48 pp. and 1272 col.; Vol. II (Barontus-Cölestiner) 1958, 1256 Col.; Vol. III, 1959, 13 pp. and 1344 Col. Herder Verlag, Freiburg.*

EVANGELISCHES KIRCHENLEXIKON. *Church and theological dictionary*. Edited by Heinz Brunotte and Otto Weber in cooperation with Robert Frick, Hans Heinrich Harms, Wilfried Joest, Hermann Noack, Kurt-Dietrich Schmidt, Georg F. Vicedom, Heinz-Dietrich Wendland and Hans Walter Wolff. Vol. I (A-G) 1956, 1736 Col.; Vol. II (H-O) 1958, 1794 Col.; Vol. III (P-Z), 1959, 1954 Col. Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Göttingen.

THE OXFORD DICTIONARY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. Edited by F. L. Cross, XIX and 1492 pp.; 1st edition, 1957, 2nd edition, 1958, Oxford University Press, London.

The fact that most of the lexicons mentioned above, with the exception of one, are new editions of works which have a first-rate reputation not only in the history of theology but also in church history, should lead us to proceed with caution, especially in regard to the title which was chosen for this review. Nevertheless, the title is apropos since—although there have always been lexicons in the scholarly circles of the modern era—never before has the need for lexicographical information and facts of various kinds been as great as it is today, which is a fundamentally new development of the contemporary intellectual situation in contrast to that of the past.

Ernesto Grassi has characterized this unique phenomenon of our immediate present by the phrase "the second Enlightenment." This second Enlightenment, he says, must definitely be differentiated from the first, the classical Enlightenment. The Enlightenment of the 18th century believed in the ultimate triumph of reason "and saw its essential task as that of sharing this ultimate form of truth with those classes which constitute the masses in contrast to the elite, and enlightening them through the popularization of knowledge."

Quite on the contrary, the present second Enlightenment makes no claims to an available fund of that which is worth knowing but attempts to educate people to do their own "theoretical and methodological thinking."

To present facts is at the same time to interpret them, and since the interpretations today are in a constant state of flux, there is a great danger that lexicons in particular rapidly become obsolete. On the other hand, the process of interpretation is precisely that which is "arresting" in the articles of encyclopedic works. It is perhaps also worth mentioning that this process is today more

strongly evident in the interpretation of individual concepts than in collective writings, as, for instance, the biblical books. Thirty years ago in Germany the student had access to at least half-a-dozen complete evangelical commentaries on the Old and New Testaments all of which stood at the top as far as the theological research of that day was concerned. Today in Germany there is no single, complete and at the same time modern work of this kind. This is a lack which we hope will soon be overcome. The commentary is no less important as a working tool than is the lexicon.

Considered from the standpoint of both its presentation and interpretation of material, *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (RGG) deserves special attention. This has always been a unique feature of this work which is now in its 3rd edition, as we have already mentioned in the review of the first volume (LW, Vol. IV, No. 4, p. 475). The theological main articles in all three editions reflect the contemporary thought of their generation with a clarity which is seldom the case in other works. The second volume and the third volume on the way to completion contain above all expositions on "dogma" (here esp. Gerhard Gloege "on the decline of this important basic concept in contemporary theology"); "eschatology" (esp. the systematic section by Paul Althaus); the comprehensive articles on *Gebet* (prayer), *Gemeinde* (congregation) and *Geschichte* (history); as well as the exposition of *Gesetz* (law) by Ernest Wolf in the light of the history of dogma and the systematic article on *Gesetz und Evangelium* (law and gospel) by Wilfried Joest. Under the keyword *Evangelium* (gospel) only references to liturgical articles, that is articles from the history of liturgy under other catch-words can be found. In the last issue the detailed and instructive article on *Kirchenbau* (church architecture) is worthy of mention.

Those of us, including the reviewer, who stand in the midst of the public discussion of modern questions are especially thankful when they also are given their just due and are treated with a measure of restraint. This is especially well done in the articles on *Funk* (radio), *Film*, *Familie*, *Frau*, *Gerontologie*, and others.

In contrast to its predecessors, the new RGG will appear in six rather than in four volumes. The first two editions were contemporaneous to a very excellent and inclusive

work comprising some 23 volumes, the old *Realenzyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* whose articles, as far as their factual content was concerned, were until recently considered to be exhaustive. A new edition of a work of this scope has not been possible in the intervening 50 years. Therefore the RGG in its present form must seek to fill in the gaps which are becoming increasingly more evident between the older *Realenzyklopädie* and scientific research. On the one hand it must take up a continually increasing fund of catch-words which today are of considerable significance to theologians, and on the other hand must seek to preserve the theological tradition according to which it was founded. This is truly an enormous task and one can only view the job which the editors have done in the face of these difficulties with astonishment.

To a lesser degree this is true also of the lexicographical work of Catholic theology, the *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* (L. Th. K.), for here something has been attempted which has not been tried in Protestantism: the publication of the second edition of a ten-volume work which was founded by Archbishop Michael Buchberger of Regensburg and which first appeared from 1930 to 1938. Actually this effort represents more than the publication of a new edition by new authors, but also a substantial expansion of the previous work. This expansion, according to the two editors, Josef Höfer and Karl Rahner was made necessary "through the changing times, the changed situation of the church and theology" and makes possible

that in the systematic as well as the historical branches of theology the central themes of theology may be given sufficient room so that more than mere information concerning them is possible and so that... the lexicon can here and there be something more than just a faithful inventory of the finished conclusions of Catholic theology.

Up till now, three volumes, those from A to the beginning of F, have been published and one must admit that the efforts of the editors have borne rich fruit. The glimpse which the Protestant reader gains into the continual development of Catholic theology is very impressive. This theology is not comprised of "final conclusions" as both its friends and enemies often maintain, and it in no way represents a self-contained intellectual

world, but is in constant conversation with other Christian and also with non-Christian thought. For example, in his very thought-provoking article on theological anthropology, Karl Rahner says that the old Catholic position in regard to the problems of Christology and anthropology that one already knows what 'man' is through the affirmation that Christ is true man" must be "asserted with greater earnestness since K. Barth and K. Heim. First of all, Catholic theology must reflect upon the fact that in large measure her statements about 'man'... are only possible because of Christology." Yes, it again becomes evident how very much the Catholic theology which is expressed here is conscious of the inner necessity to think again about her own position. This relieves the contributions from all attempts at an apologetic either against Protestant thought (such as in the articles on the translation of the Bible) vocation, the unity of the church) or against modern scientific theories (the origin of man, where the opportunity affords itself and where they might be expected. It is also a very fine ecumenical portent that particular fields of Protestant theology are written about by Protestant authors such as *Apologetik nach protestantischen Glaubensverständnis* by Wentzel Lohff, *Protestantische Ethik* by Walter Künneth, or *Protestantische Exegese* by Heinrich Greeven.

Furthermore, something must be said about the wealth of individual events of church history, even the history of the Protestant churches, which are presented here in such a manner that, for example, even an event such as the *Bordelumsche Rotte*, which occurred in Schleswig Holstein in the 18th century, as remote as it is from the Catholic church, is nevertheless presented with complete literature references. Only in those accounts which deal with present-day mission areas (Africa, Asia) could one have wished for a more exhaustive treatment of the history of non-Catholic missions. Even the Protestant theologian will find this a very essential reference book because of the wealth of facts presented in those areas which do not necessarily belong to the realm of *Kontrovers-theologie* (Catholic-Protestant relations).

While the above-mentioned works more than do justice to both requisites of an inclusive lexicon, the presentation and the interpretation of facts, a less exhaustive work will naturally place more emphasis upon one aspect than the other. How

this is done in the *Evangelischen Kirchenlexikon* (EKL) on the one hand and the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* on the other is already implied in the place which each occupies in the total program of its publishers. The EKL originated with the old *Calwer Kirchenlexikon*; the ODCC is a publication of the Oxford University Press which publishes one-volume reference works which present trustworthy, although certainly not exhaustive, information in special areas of intellectual life. In the EKL the emphasis is placed on interpretation; in the ODCC it is on the presentation of facts.

For some months now the three-volume EKL has been in print. Its special value is its usefulness in the practical ministry which is due both to the choice of articles and the manner in which they are presented. It is a reference book for practical use. We are coming out of a time in which such a statement is faint praise. Without doubt, the keen young theologians of the last few generations have been more attracted to the historical and philological problems in theology than by those questions involved in translating the results of exegetical endeavors into something of relevance to the preaching task of the church. This important, and for the service of the gospel perhaps most important, step has for a long time been attempted more from an emotional than from an intellectual standpoint. Precisely this is what is excitingly new about the EKL; here a really intellectual work is entering the service of the church. Not only are there detailed and reliable articles on historical and systematic theology; not only can one find here everything there is to know about cult and liturgy, which is especially helpful for those who must make direct decisions about these things in the life of a congregation; but there are also detailed presentations of the modern spheres of press, film, socialism, etc. Moreover, large and important areas of concern are reported in a very ecumenical manner so that in the history of theology, for example, every church and geographical realm is represented by a characteristic renowned figure. Everyone active in ecumenical work will not only use this reference work as a fund of personal knowledge, but will above all be thankful for the exercise it presents in the practice of ecumenical thinking, through which one can finally be freed from the ghetto of specialization. It is hoped that extensive use will be made of this means of bringing the

ecumenical movement down to the "grass-roots." Certainly, as far as the number of articles is concerned, the principle followed here is *non multa, sed multum*. This means that questions regarding individual items are not answered here, or, on the other hand, the ecumenical curiosity, which has its rightful place, finds greater satisfaction in the Oxford Dictionary.

In principle, however, this dictionary presupposes an entirely different circle of readers, namely, not people in the service of the church and probably not even Christians as such, but the "general public." It attempts to provide information for those who continually run up against the institutions of the Christian church with their innumerable involvements in the general life of western man and those who have perhaps become estranged from the church. Herein lies the unavoidable one-sidedness of the work which the editor himself acknowledges: the western world is more strongly represented than is the eastern, Europe more than other continents. England plays a much greater role than do other countries and the Anglican communion is the point of departure for the presentations of other churches. But this is not necessarily a disadvantage; for it shows—as is explicit in the foreword with references to Wilhelm Dilthey and Ernst Troeltsch—that there is an unavoidable principle of selection in all historical thought; and it also shows that a comparison to other religious traditions is an essential factor in understanding different cultural and intellectual backgrounds which influence this tradition and in turn are influenced by her. Particularly in this dictionary one perceives something of the universality of the Christian faith. To those from a Lutheran tradition, much may seem unknown and unusual; much also, such as the article on "exegesis" may seem to have been written somewhat superficially to those who are interested in questions of biblical theology. But one thing becomes increasingly evident: the real living closeness of the Anglican communion to the tradition and presence of the Catholic church. One becomes aware of this particularly in the first-rate bibliographical sections at the conclusion of articles which are often somewhat short in themselves.

6,000 catchwords and articles on less than 1,500 pages—this is no mean work in itself, and a great deal of information is contained here which cannot be found in more exhaustive works. Furthermore, there are always more

than sufficient references for further study. The Oxford Dictionary is unique as a single volume reference book, and one can well understand that just one year after its appearance in October 1957 a second printing was necessary. We should like to recommend this book to all readers outside of England who are acquainted with English so that they might enrich themselves by its fund of knowledge.

HANS BOLEWSKI

The Ancient Church

CONFESSEURS ET MARTYRS. *Successeurs des prophètes dans l'Eglise des trois premiers siècles.* By Marc Lods. (*Cahiers théologiques* 41) Paris & Neuchâtel, 1958. 82 pp.

EARLY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES. By J.H.D. Kelly. London, 1958. XII and 501 pp.

THE EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By Philip Carrington. Cambridge, 1957. 2 vols. XX and 501; XIII and 489 pp., index and bibliographies.

NEUTESTAMENTLICHE APOKRYPHEN IN DEUTSCHER ÜBERSETZUNG. 3. completely new edition by Wilhelm Schneemelcher, Vol. I; *The Gospels*, VIII, 377 pp. J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1959. DM 24.00.

Theologorum Anglorum non est, scholasticis rerum involutionibus inhiare—so wrote the learned Württemberg prelate Pfaff in his *Introductio*—sed *eleganti dictione et suaviore atque simpliciore ratiocinio, vocata et in partes veteris Ecclesiae traditione, sua tradere. Unde, si qui sunt, qui historiam dogmatum Christianorum pleniorum tradidere, haec sane laus theologis Anglicanis debetur.*¹

This judgment certainly holds true for all three of the works reviewed here, although the first of our authors, who bears the name

of a famous exegete, is no Anglican but a Lutheran theologian and dean of the Faculty of Evangelical Theology at Paris. His monograph is a summary of a doctoral thesis. The theme of the work is already implied in its title. It traces the line of continuity which is perceptible between the prophetic ministry of the primitive church and the martyrs and witnesses of the ancient church. He begins his investigation with a study of the unity of the prophetic office in both the Old and the New Testaments, as it was interpreted by the church of the New Testament—thereby agreeing with the thesis of Dom Gregory Dix, that the New Testament prophets did not constitute an organized clergy. But by the second century the spiritual personalities who were accepted uncritically and without hesitation by the church, belonged to the past. Prophets are now critically judged according to those of the Old and New Testaments. From this perspective it is possible to view the martyrs and confessors as their true successors. Lods illustrates the many positive lines of connection which result from such a comparison. The martyrs are also recipients of the Holy Spirit (pp. 28 ff.); they are granted extatic visions, as were the prophets; they also participate in the struggle of the Holy Ghost against Satan (pp. 49 ff.); the martyrs are called to a special service of bearing witness just as were the prophets (pp. 60 ff.), in fact, they even influence the election of the regular clergy (p. 67) etc. In this connection the author sketches the outlines of a theology of martyrdom in large strokes and with exemplary clarity (pp. 18 ff.; martyrdom as redemption from the world, as service to God and as participation in the death of Christ). He does not consider Hellenism (for example, salvation from the bonds of the flesh, p. 22) to be a very significant influence. Therefore the decline of the prophetic function of the martyrs is not the result of outside influences. The death of the martyrs "for" the church (p. 42) originally expresses a spiritual solidarity, to which the idea of a corporate salvation belongs, but not that of a substitutionary act. Despite that, the idea of merit enters in. The participation in the death of Christ is considered as contributing to salvation despite the protest of Tertullian (pp. 55 ff.); so that, from the third century on, the role of the martyr slowly shifts from that of prophet to that of mediator. But it is a change from within the church. Therefore, for example, faith in the intercessory

¹ "It is not the custom of English divines to lose themselves in the mazes of academic theology. Rather do they put forward their own teaching most elegantly and by sweet and simple reasoning; calling for help upon the tradition of the church of old. Hence if there be any to whom our praise is due for teaching us abundantly the history of doctrine, the Anglican divines deserve all admiration."

prayers of the dead and, in particular, of witnesses to the faith are of purely Christian origin (p. 63). In this sense one can say that the thought of earning merit has spelled the end of the prophetic spirit.

In passing, there are a number of other details worthy of note. The author does not consider Montanism a genuine variation of the primitive prophetic movement, because it arises in an era in which the prophetic spirit already belongs to the past (p. 14). Martyrdom as a sacrifice is the counterpart of the cult of the Caesar (p. 24). The parallel between the passion of Christ and martyrdom—which is a commonplace of all martyrologies—is not merely a secondary literary form but expresses the motif with which the martyr himself went to his death (p. 27).

The work of Lods has been criticized because it does not prove its thesis concerning the doctrine of merit and its destructive influence. Is this critique valid for the original work of the author or is this lack the result of the resumé being reviewed? Even so, the apparatus is amazingly large and instructive. It would have been a deed worthy of the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique or some similar organization to have made the entire text available.

J.N.D. KELLY's *Ancient Christian Creeds* could well be counted among the most famous works on patristics in recent years. With the present book the author presents a successor to the well-known textbook of Bethune-Baker which has become obsolete at many points. This is evident from the table of contents which concludes with Chalcedon and thus is adapted to the teaching plan of Oxford (*History of Christian Doctrine to A. D. 461*). At the same time, however, it is a completely new work. Despite the fact that the author modestly refers to the classical historians of Christian dogma (Tixeront, Seeberg), his presentation is in many respects his own and new. This is particularly evident from the completely "modern" chapters dealing with the Scriptures and tradition as well as with eschatology. Ecclesiology also receives strong emphasis. In the first chapter the presentations of such "modern classics," as Van den Eynde and Flesseman van Leer, are largely followed (pp. 29 ff.). The author depicts the changes in eschatology by means of a curve, with special stress on its expansion (taking up of new questions, for example, the interim status, pg. 468) without a radical switch over from "realized" to future eschatology. His presen-

tation of the Greco-Roman thought world can also be characterized as "modern" (pp. 6 ff.); he sees it neither as a world of pure philosophical categories which gave the church merely formal categories in which to express itself, nor as composed only of competing religions. This can be clearly seen in his description of the theology of Origen, where he again and again (e.g., pp. 128 ff.), sees the double motifs of strong ecclesiastical and at the same time of neoPlatonist influences.

Although the author maintained at the very beginning that he would not attempt to set up definitions of what dogma, the history of dogma and orthodoxy are, certain presuppositions crop up time and time again. These also belong to his "modernity." Therefore, for example, he not only understands the doctrine of the Trinity from the perspective of Christology but he sees the divine triad as the basis for the whole theological development (for example, Part 2, Pre-Nicene Theology) that is, he sees the three-fold rule of faith already present in the thought of the earliest theologians. This is then interpreted with more or less clarity, and with a greater or lesser degree of emphasis upon monotheism (e.g., the famous controversy between East and West, p. 106). The "triadic pattern" (p. 101) is older than the originally still very confused theology of the Trinity. At the same time, this common presupposition explains the origin of the theology, in which the Godhead is described as "one person," e.g., that of the Apologists and Irenaeus on the one hand, and the later manner of expression (p. 108) as "three persons." The Swedish text-book of B. Hägglund, which appeared a few years ago, makes an interesting comparison at this point.

This introduces a further characteristic of Kelly's book; his strong emphasis upon the unity of the entire history of doctrine in the ancient church. For example, he advocates a minimal interpretation of Nicaea (p. 236); *homoousion* refers here only to the full divinity of the Son and not to his unity in substance with the Father. In this manner the author succeeds in making easily understandable the post-Nicene controversies, and, above all, the rapid *rapprochement* between the exponents of both *homoousion* and *homoeousion* (p. 254). Ephesus and Chalcedon are also understandable if the Christologies of the Antiochean and Alexandrian schools are seen not, as in the

last analysis irreducible definitions of Christ, but as alternative attempts to define the same image of Christ, one with the help of an Aristotelian "word-man," and the other a more Platonic "word-flesh" Christology (pp. 287 ff.).

There are also some further interesting details; the Patristic doctrine of inspiration with the emphasis upon the extatic element in the biblical authors (pp. 62 ff.); the difference between typological and allegorical exegesis (pp. 70 ff.); the change in the doctrine of penance, and even in ecclesiology under the influence of the perspectives of pastoral care; from a communion of saints, the church becomes a "training-ground for sinners" (pp. 199 ff. Carrington sees this differently).

We would beg leave to ask one question. Kelly sets the various familiar teachings concerning the work of Christ next to one another (pp. 163 ff., and pp. 375 ff.) and stresses especially the doctrine of Christ's sacrifice as found in the Greek fathers (p. 384). Kelly himself sees, both here and earlier, the unity of the various perspectives guaranteed by the idea of recapitulation (p. 376), which is not only taught by all, but which provides the obvious presupposition for the other doctrines. Isn't the accent upon the difference between the doctrine of Christ as teacher and as sacrifice a little too strong here for this early period (the Apologists, etc., pp. 164 ff.)? One need only think of the connection between *ἐπιγνώσις* and *σωτηρία* already in the New Testament (I Tim. 2:4 and parallels) and on the usage of *φωτισμός* in the early church in connection with baptism (and therewith also with Christ's death and freedom from Satan). Could it not be that Kelly's suggested separation between teaching and salvation reflects a 20th century anachronism?

Another word to this observation. We are dealing here with a text-book, which does contain excellent references; perhaps a new edition could contain a system of cross references, for example, from p. 151 (Tertullian's Christology) to pp. 337 ff. (Leo ad Flavianum), in order to show that there is not only a theological heritage common to both, but that the *Tomus Leonis* is in part almost a compendium of quotations from Tertullian. Would it not also be proper, for instance in the case of the four negatives of Chalcedon (p. 340), which are treated in a somewhat left-handed fashion, to refer to their use in a different, non-Christological context in the Arian controversy? This would be so much the

more welcome because Kelly in other places (pp. 229, 234) very carefully explains the *termini technici* of ancient theology.

The Anglican archbishop of Quebec is no longer a stranger among theologians since the appearance of his book *The Primitive Christian Catechism*. In his new history of primitive Christianity he has, in the opinion of this reviewer, succeeded in writing a master-piece of legibility and usefulness, hardly surpassed even by Duchesne's classic *Histoire ancienne de l'église*. This book is also intended as a textbook, so the chapters are arranged in short sections which facilitate reference. At the beginning of every chapter there is a short summary and in-between are chronological tables and genealogies.

CARRINGTON characterizes his own tendency in this book (Introduction) as "to trust the evidence," and this he does in his presentation. For example, on the basis of Clement and Tacitus he accepts the fact that both Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome under Nero (p. 196); Marcion in his opinion did not originate the Canon and church order, but evidences by his very use of these ideas that they existed prior to him (II, pp. 82 ff.). The author, like Kelly, has been criticized for his conservatism and for his tendency to simplify the problems (reviews in the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, April, 1959). But is this not common to the nature of every great synthesis, which is not pure speculation? Didn't the great master of research on the Council of Trent, Professor Jedin, have to defend himself against similar accusations in the foreword to Vol. 2 of his history of the Council?

Because of the variety of material presented, it is difficult to do justice to this work of Carrington's otherwise than in a critical article. Therefore we shall pick out a few things in telegram-style: Rev. 13 was originally aimed at Caligula, and then was re-written in terms of Nero (p. 73); Josephus is an example of the rapid influx of Judaistic Christian literature in the realm of the Greek language (pp. 240 ff. and 254); Justin's Dialogue with Trypho is no literary fiction but the record of an event which actually took place (II, pp. 54 ff.). The author often emphasizes the role of "schools" in the early years of the Roman church (II, pp. 86 ff.); he frequently gives an analysis of entire works, such as of most of the New Testament writings (Vol. I), or Justin's first *Apology* (II, pp. 107 ff.).

There are three great complexes of questions which deserve special mention: the author

treats the apocalyptic literature as a thoroughly poetical literary form which we must understand as pictorial and inventive (e.g. p. 116). Hermas should be compared to Spenser or Bunyan and not to Cerinthus or Valentinus (p. 402). This is true also for the eschatology which is expressed therein; it is misunderstood when taken *au pied de la lettre*. This was done by a later generation, which no longer understood this literary form (II, pg. 6). Not even the eschatology of the Kataphrygians (Pepuza) is to be taken literally, as is commonly the case.

The change in the nature of penance in the ancient church, and above all the development of the much easier Roman discipline in comparison to that of Tertullian (II, p. 420) is not so much the emergence of a new laxity in contrast to the older rigorism, as the crystallization of one of many contemporary and competing "solutions" to the problem of discipline. Tertullian is no longer representative of the old "perfectionism" but of a hardening toward "puritanism" which made another solution necessary and justified. (II, pp. 445 ff.).

The author begins with Alexander the Great and treats the third century in a sort of epilogue. One volume covers New Testament history, and the history prior to it, which enables the author to sketch a broad panorama of Hellenism, especially that of Syria. Thereby the author underscores the relationship between late Judaism and the Hellenistic thought world, showing that not only was early Christianity subject to Hellenization, but so also was the background out of which it came (chap. 1). He also believes that the very earliest Christian preaching was bilingual (pp. 47 ff.). Similarly, the sharp difference between the apostolic and the post-apostolic eras are the result of an "optical illusion" (pp. 386 ff.). The post-apostolic literature was no substitute for that of the apostolic age, but an addition or appendix to it. This of course does not obviate the natural difference between generations: Ignatius writes on the basis of the apostolic writings, while Clement works "directly from the Old Testament" as did the apostles themselves (p. 468).

Here also a few remarks may be permissible: Is it really possible to describe the Gnosticism of Valentinus (II, pp. 76 ff.) in psycho-analytical terms? Is it accurate to ascribe the religious policy of the empire to the personal political decisions of individual emperors (for example, II, p. 167, Marcus Aurelius)

and thereby to make so little of the influence of the religious groups, the prevailing concept of the state, and impersonal officialdom? In a new edition the correction of a few errors in style would also be in order (p. 7, cast "up" horoscopes; p. 379, "if" instead of "it"; p. 416, "the virginity and motherhood of Jesus"; II, p. 132, misuse of "ideogram" and II, p. 323 of "materialism"). Of even more value would be a third volume in which the author would make available the large fund of references which he purposely omitted from this work. The appearance, some years ago, of the work by the Viennese historian, F. Heer, *Aufgang Europas* shows that such an undertaking is not impossible.

In conclusion a gem from the book itself:

Apelles was an old war-horse of the Roman school, who became its leading figure in his old age. Like Melito and Proclus he was held up as a model of the celibate life and the ascetic virtues; but Tertullian says that he had an affair with a girl, which necessitated his leaving Rome for a time; a similar tale was told about Marcion himself, though Tertullian does not seem to have heard of that one. In any case Apelles went off to Alexandria... (II, p. 258).

Is this not reminiscent of Duchesne's description of Cyril's "théologie trop coûteuse"? Who can resist the charm of such a *suavius atque simplicius ratiocinium*?

PETER FRAENKEL

The abundance of material in the third edition of the former "HENNECKE" makes it impossible within the bounds of this review to give more than a few hints as to content. Our hope is that the reader will turn to the work itself and let the experts who cooperated in its editing lead him into the material. The work is no longer a "Hennecke" but a "Schneemelcher" and should be cited as such: in this first volume little besides the general formation has remained from the second edition (one thing that was retained is the section by A. Meyer on Jesus' relationship). This new work shows how our knowledge of "apocryphal" literature on the life of Jesus has grown: the 110 pages of the second edition have expanded three times over. Particularly striking is the increase of gnostic material. In Prof. Puech, the editor of this material, we have one of the leading authorities in this field. He, of course, treats the previously published pieces found at Nag Hamadi and reports on the present state of research on the same. It also becomes clear how much more complicated the increase in material

and the more exact study of the sources had made the questions in some respects, although both things have of course also advanced our understanding considerably.

A general introduction (to volumes one and two) from the pen of Schneemelcher attempts to clarify the concepts "apocryphal" and "canonical," concepts which are complicated intrinsically and historically. Surveying the history of the canon, Schneemelcher gives translations of several particularly pertinent texts; then he sketches the quite various motives that went into the composition of the apocryphal writings. In the introduction to volume one he sheds some light on the relation between the New Testament and the "apocryphal" gospels. Each group of writings and each writing is preceded by a thorough introduction. Some of the larger groupings of texts are the so-called "dispersed sayings of the Lord" (edited by Jeremias), papyri fragments (Jeremias, Schneemelcher), Jewish Christian gospels (Vielhauer) and infancy gospels (Cullmann). Other scholars in addition to those already named, who worked on the remaining writings are Walter Bauer, Duensing (*Epistola Apostolorum*), Christian Maurer (*Gospel of Peter*), van den Oudenrijn and Scheidweiler.

Although all the existing material could not be included in spite of the size of the book, still all the more important documents are complete and there are characteristic excerpts from the others. Of great value too, in addition to the editorial comments, are the bibliographical references (also on editions of texts), some of which are quite comprehensive. The comments take up a number of problems connected with the text, with literary and tradition criticism, and—inseparable from these—problems of content, church history and the history of theology. Where scholars are still undecided on questions (perhaps for decades now), or where the inadequacy of the existing sources is such as to preclude unequivocal answer, the editors frequently show noteworthy restraint, even when the particular editor himself holds to a certain view (e.g. with regard to Jewish Christian gospels).

All this makes "Schneemelcher" a work which points the way on many questions of research. Some of the areas where it lays the foundation for future fruitful study are: the history of Christian piety in the second to the fourth centuries (in the more important passages, the book extends at least this

far and sometimes even farther); in this first volume, the study of the genre "gospel" (in the infancy gospels, e.g., essential differences come out between canonical and apocryphal texts); study of the tradition of Jesus.

GERHARD DELLING

Contemporary Crises

GESAMMELTE SCHRIFTEN. Vol. II, *Kirchenkampf und Finkenwalde*. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Munich: Christian Kaiser Verlag, 1959. 667 pp. DM 23.20.

DIE KIRCHE IM STURM DER ZEITEN. *The Reformed Church in Hungary at the time of the two World Wars, the Revolution and the Counter-Revolution*. By Imre Kádár. Budapest, 1958. 196 pp.

The second volume of the four-volume series of BONHOEFFER'S writings being edited by Eberhard Bethge is a collection of various documents, written between 1933 and 1943. It is similar to the first volume both in form and in content. Evident again is the dedicated labor and the painstaking thoroughness of the editor in assembling all material pertaining to the young martyr of the Confessional Church. As a result, not only is new light shed on the life and thought of the man himself, but a critical decade in the history of the church and of the world is resurrected in all its tension and pathos.

Bonhoeffer is not slow in coming to grips with the issues confronting him. A critical article on the leadership principle appears on the day after Hitler became Chancellor. It is soon expanded into a lecture delivered in Berlin at the *Hochschule für Politik*. Bonhoeffer attributes the rise of the concept of *Führer* and its hold especially upon the young, not only to the political and economic conditions prevailing in Germany after the first World War, but to a change in mental attitude. The search for community in the midst of inner brokenness and depersonalization has brought reproach upon such ideas as individuality, personality, and liberalism. The needs of individuals as well as of society are not to be fulfilled by the one strong individual who is the concrete embodiment of the spirit of the people as a whole. His authority,

unlike that of the father, the teacher, or the statesman, is not determined by the office which he holds. It is nothing less than metaphysical and religious in nature. Bonhoeffer senses from the beginning the danger which this "chiliastic" idea will hold for Christianity and insists that only under the sovereignty of the true God can men be free and responsible individuals.

Bonhoeffer speaks his mind with the same alacrity and clarity on the Jewish question. A state which seeks on the basis of race to exclude people from membership in Christian churches and to deprive pastors of their office is abusing its proper function. This is not a matter of external organization but concerns the very essence of the church. The church belongs to Christ, not to a race or nation. Its membership is not determined by human homogeneity. It consists of people of diverse backgrounds who have been called by the word to constitute a community which transcends the boundaries of race and nation. Bonhoeffer and his associates thus proceed to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the gospel and its secularization and paganization in the platform of the *deutsche Christen*. The positive re-affirmation of evangelical doctrine in response to this challenge finds expression in the Bethel Confession of 1933, the original draft of which is here printed in full.

From the fall of 1933 to late summer of 1935 Bonhoeffer is in London, using every opportunity to promote the interests of the Confessional Church and the Pastors' Emergency League, while serving as pastor of a German church in the British capital. The editor brings to light additional correspondence with Bishop Bell, a staunch sympathizer and helper. Among the letters of introduction written by the bishop to provide needed contacts is one addressed to Mahatma Gandhi. It is unfortunate that Bonhoeffer's proposed visit to India failed to materialize, for it would undoubtedly have helped to focus his attention upon the world mission of the church, an interest which his preoccupation with the German church struggle appears to have pushed aside. This period is also marked by sustained correspondence with Karl Barth, revealing a wealth of common conviction. Indeed, Bell refers to Bonhoeffer as "a follower of Karl Barth." With characteristic bluntness Barth frowns upon Bonhoeffer's tarrying in England and calls him back to Germany.

The next collection of writings, from 1935 to 1939, presents Bonhoeffer as a "critical defender of the Confessional Church." Typical of his thinking is an essay entitled *Zur Frage nach der Kirchengemeinschaft*, 1936. The young theologian is at his analytical and critical best as he grapples with the basic question of the essence of the church. The true starting point is not who belongs or does not belong to the church but rather what makes the church the church. The answer is: the church is where Christ is with his gospel. The church cannot draw its own outward boundaries. The world does this by its response to what the church proclaims. The church's one concern is to be true to the gospel by which it lives. The church's confession thus assumes pivotal importance. By confession, however, is not meant a stringing together of theological statements. Indeed "correct" doctrine becomes "false" doctrine when it is used in opposition to the gospel. Confession is a matter of faith, not of theology. The unity based on common confession is not reached by seeking to arrive at agreement on one point of doctrine after another. It is a given, total, qualitative unity. Bonhoeffer is convinced that the Confessional Church is the one true church of Christ in Germany. Its confessional unity, as Barmen demonstrates, transcends the traditional distinctions between Lutheran and Reformed. It must now bear the responsibility of being what it professes to be, the true church, treading its way between the Scylla of orthodoxy, which confuses confession and theology, and the Charybdis of confessionlessness, which confuses confession and pious witness.

Bonhoeffer's wartime activities during 1940-1943 are portrayed chiefly through varied correspondence, much of it with the editor himself. Giving up the personal safety provided him by his friends in America, he carries on his mission under severe difficulties. His seminary is closed, his opportunity to preach restricted, his right to publish even theological works denied. His every move is under the surveillance of the Gestapo, and from time to time he is arrested. In vain he appeals to the authorities, seeking to refute the charge of seditious activity, listing his family background, describing the non-political character of his work, even appending the customary *Heil Hitler* to his plea. In the midst of all this he succeeds both in playing a leading role in holding the line for the beleaguered Confessional Church

and in continuing his own scholarly research. It is highly interesting to see his *Ethics* taking during shape these troubled years. Thus he studies the ethics of Roman Catholicism, finding it, on the whole, "unbearably legalistic," and yet full of practical wisdom which cannot be dismissed as mere casuistry.

The closing section deals with Bonhoeffer's work as director of the Predigerseminar at Finkenwalde. It is for this work that he was preparing already during his sojourn in England, and it was here above all that he felt his calling to be. The reports and circular letters presented here disclose not only an instructional program following faithfully the doctrinal lines set forth at Barmen and Dahlem but also a closely knit religious brotherhood persisting beyond the period of study. Special attention and care must be given to the "young brethren" who serve the confessional cause fervently under the handicap of having no official status in the churches. Bonhoeffer keeps close touch with them and their families as they go in and out of prisons and as many of them later become war casualties. With the forced closing of the seminary at Finkenwalde in 1937, its work is carried on in the form of *Sammelvikariate*. By the spring of 1940 this fugitive seminary too is dissolved. But Bonhoeffer's letters of encouragement to the brethren continue. The theme of the final one here printed is joy in God, which looks death in the face and even there sees life.

The turbulent decade with which this book deals is of crucial importance in the annals of the church, and Bonhoeffer's continuing influence demands that his involvement in it in thought and in deed be correctly understood. But for a proper appraisal it is necessary to have the fullest possible documentation. This is what Bethge's labor provides. Its value is enhanced by an appended "time table" listing in detail the events of Bonhoeffer's life in their political and ecclesiastical setting. Bonhoeffer's interpretation of the church and its confession is open to debate. But no one will disagree with the inscription which appears on a memorial tablet in the church at Flossenbürg: "Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a witness of Jesus Christ among his brethren." (*Ein Zeuge Jesu Christi unter seinen Brüdern.*)

T. A. KANTONEN.

The book by IMRE KÁDÁR, professor at the Reformed Theological Academy in Budapest, makes no claim to being a history of the

Hungarian Church in the last 40 years. The author himself admits he could present "neither a systematic theological analysis, nor an analysis from church history" (p. 13 f.). The book limits itself to giving a detailed documentation of the political position of the Hungarian Reformed Church in the above-mentioned period.

Even this limited theme is handled from the perspective of a particular political position. The statements of the church, its decrees, sermons and articles are all judged in the light of their relationship to the present proletarian dictatorship in Hungary. The searchlights are specially aimed at those who took over the leadership of the church in the Fall of 1956, following Bishops Bereczky and Peter and other church leaders, such as the author himself.

The picture of the political position of the Hungarian Reformed Church, which is presented in this way is anything but encouraging. The official policies of the Horthy Regime during the time between the two World Wars, with its one-sided social policies—or rather with its lack of such—its nationalism, its revisionism, and its anti-semitism, were allowed to go uncriticised by the church, even though they were not approved.

The author, however, should have presented a more complete picture. Had he also described the position of the church leadership during the years 1948-56, his presentation would have been much more inclusive and more accurately substantiated. A survey of the speeches and articles which were presented in the church upon special occasions, for example, those in honor of Joseph Stalin or Matyas Rakosi—persons whose names are not to be mentioned in Hungary today—would evidenced how the church has allowed itself to shift with the winds of political expediency.

Many more evidences of omission and one-sidedness could be cited. All in all, the book suffers from a lamentable lack of historical perspective, particularly in the areas of church history and the history of theology. It is easy today to accuse the church of lacking an ecumenical sense of responsibility in 1918 (p. 75), or to lay all blame on the Horthy Regime for the financial situation of the church during the economic crisis in the thirties (p. 71). It would have been much more difficult, but certainly more just, to have attempted to understand each period according to its own presuppositions.

Since the basis from which the author writes is so weak, one is not surprised to find a very decided emotional anti-Catholicism in this book (p. 74), or to find that theological professors, whose position in regard to the proletarian dictatorship is condemned by the author, are not given any credit for intellectual ability (p. 137). The author also makes frequent use of political key-words, such as condemning the political activity of "important western circles" (p. 143). For an observer from the West it is always difficult to understand that people, such as the author

of this book, are capable of delivering their colleagues and fellow Christians to the political powers of the proletarian dictatorship through such dangerous political accusations (p. 52).

As long as the claims maintained in this book cannot be publicly refuted by the church leaders who have been so bitterly attacked in it, the book, despite a good deal of reliable material concerning the political position of the Hungarian Reformed Church, can only be seen as a very biased political presentation.

L. G. TERRAY

PLANNING THE LUTHERAN WORLD

After two years of service Pastor Harold Remus has left the editorial staff of the Lutheran World. In the course of the development of this publication a fixed system evolved whereby a younger American theologian, usually at the conclusion of a year of study at an European University, above all a German University, joins the editorial staff for about two years. In this way, Harold Remus cooperated in the translating and planning of Lutheran World.

These two years of working together have been happy years, for which I should like to thank him once more. The "assistant editor" fulfills an important function: that of freeing the editor from the one-sidedness which threatens because of his location, denominational and national background, official activities and many other things. The younger colleague must continually bring those things and persons to his attention which would otherwise escape him. For the Europeans, among whom the editor certainly feels himself, the assistant editor embodies American Protestantism with its in many respects different institutional forms, its different ecclesiastical and theological problematic, yes, also its critique and questioning of the traditional Christianity of the so-called mother-land which caused many of the fore-fathers of today's generation of Americans to emigrate to the New World. Harold Remus filled this role of an admonishing and suggesting companion so well that the publication in those two important years after the world assembly in Minneapolis received the direction it needed in this new phase of world Lutheranism. His successor is Pastor Otto Sommer of Comstock Park, Michigan, USA whom we hope will continue the work in like fashion.

In the past two years the idea of having a topic for each issue, a topic wide enough and yet at the same time specific enough to set a clear general theme, has recommended itself more and more to the editorial-staff. In this way we should like to introduce the pastors who are active in the not always easy ecumenical task in their congregations to the theological discussions involved, giving them material which is trustworthy and which on the other hand is more than the mere transmission of facts. The important thing in the ecumenical movement, as every where else under the Lordship of Christ is truth and love. This is easy to say, but to do it, that is, to translate it into activity demands both effort and self-discipline, and that includes also intellectual discipline. As theologians we should not be so conceited as to think that the laity do not want this.

Perhaps the last two issues were among the best examples of such general themes. Volume 2 of this year, as you remember, dealt with Eastern Orthodoxy and Volume 1 was dedicated to the problems of exegesis and hermeneutics. The issues of last year, in a similar manner, dealt with certain general areas—Roman Catholicism, Christian education, the cooperation between pastors and laymen, and the current problems of Africa.

At the present time future issues are being planned along these lines. The current issue deals with the general theme "The Ministry and Worship"; the next, which concludes volume VI, will concentrate on questions concerning preaching

with contributions by Per Erik Persson (Lund, Sweden), Thorleif Borman (Oslo, Norway) and William H. K. Narum (Northfield, Minnesota). The first issue of the following volume (VII), which will appear in May/June 1960, will be dedicated to the problems of the world confessional organizations. Volume 2 will attack those problems which sociological research has discovered to be of especial concern in our modern mass society: loneliness, freedom and conformity. In the second half of next year 1960-61 we should like to turn our attention to the question of the challenges which a world determined by such phenomena presents for evangelization and work among the younger generations both inside and outside the church.

The planning of a publication of this kind, whose readers live on all continents, must be long-range, but it must at the same time possess enough elasticity to take up new questions which may occur outside of the planning. Therefore it is very possible that this program of the editorial staff may have to undergo many changes.

In fact, we are even open to changing the entire plan if it be the desire of our friends and readers. If anyone has suggestions or desires along this line, please bring them to the attention of the editorial staff.

Furthermore if anyone has anything to report, he should send his article about his country, church or congregation either to Geneva or to Loccum. The material of interest in reporting ecumenical events is varied. An occurrence in a small town or in a college can often be of more significance than the sessions of a world committee which sits down to discuss the same points and to draft the same resolutions year after year. Anyone who would like to make a contribution to the ecumenical discussion in this manner is always welcome, provided that his main concern is his subject and not himself, for this publication seeks always to render faithful service to its subject and that subject is nothing less than the Lordship of Christ.

HANS BOLEWSKI

EDITORIAL NOTES

In this issue we have requested Dr. PETER BRUNNER, professor of systematic theology at Heidelberg, Germany, to state his position on the question of the ordination of women to the ministry, which to some extent opposes that of Dr. Sten Rodhe of Malmö, reported in the Vol. IV, No. 4 and Vol. V, No. 4, issues. Because of the importance of this subject, we felt that a thorough presentation was warranted. The other two main articles are by Dr. REGIN PRENTER, professor of dogmatic theology at the University of Aarhus, Denmark, and Dr. VILMOS VAJTA, director of the Commission on Theology of the LWF in Geneva.

The authors of the reports are Dr. CARL GUSTAV DIEHL, director of the Church of Sweden Mission in Uppsala; Pastor WILLIAM A. DUDDE, English editor of the News Bureau of the LWF in Geneva; H. TORREY WALKER, executive-secretary of the Board of Publication of the United Lutheran Church in America with headquarters in Philadelphia, Pa.; LEWIS S. MUDGE, theological secretary of the World Presbyterian Alliance in the WCC; Dr. HANFRIED KRÜGER, director of the Arbeitsgemeinschaft Christlicher Kirchen in Germany, Oekumenische Centrale Frankfurt/M; Pastor H. W. VON MEYENN, director of the information service of the Religious Broadcasting Center in Bethel in Bielefeld; Dr. PETER HEYDE, Master of Business Administration on the staff of the Bonn office of the International Labour Office.

Contributors of book reviews are Prof. George A. Lindbeck, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., USA; Pastor Ingo Baldermann, Katechetisches Amt, Loccum, by Hannover; Dr. Gunnar Hillerdal, University of Lund, Sweden; Dr. Hans Bolewski, director of the Evangelical Academy, Loccum, by Hannover; Dr. Peter Fraenkel, Lund, Sweden; Prof. Gerhard Dellling, Halle, Saale; Prof. Taito A. Kantonen, Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio, USA; Pastor Laszlo G. Terray, Kirkens Nødhjelp, Oslo, Norway.

*The quotation by Martin Buber on the first page comes from the book *Eclipse of God, Studies in the Relation between Religion and Philosophy*, and is printed by kind permission of Harper Brothers, who published it in 1952. Luther's theology of the cross reveals both agreements and differences in regard to this serious and critical comment on the current situation by Martin Buber.*

After the publication of the last issue, the editor received the following letter from Dr. Peter Fraenkel, of Lund, Sweden, which we should like to make available in its entirety to our readers, because of its importance.

*"A stupid mistake has been made by your reviewer in *Lutheran World of May/June 1959* (p. 91) concerning the volume *Wort und Mysterium*. It is stated there that the volume contains (a translation of) Melancthon's special Greek version of the Augsburg Confession. In fact, however, Document No. VI does not give a text but only an introduction, and characterization of this text and a facsimile reproduction of its first page as printed in the *Acta and Scripta*. I ask you to print these lines by way of correction and apology. My only excuse for this impardonable piece of carelessness is that it may have been induced by wishful thinking; it would have been good if the volume had really contained the text."*

LUTHERAN WORLD
publication of the
LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

Editorial Board :

Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, Bishop Lajos Ordass, Bishop Bo Giertz, Bishop Rajah B. Manikam,
Dr. Rudolf Weeber, Dr. Carl E. Lund-Quist

Editor :

The Rev. Dr. Hans Bolewski,
Evangelical Academy, Loccum/Wunstorf (Hann.), Germany

Assistant for the English Language Edition :

The Rev. Mr. Otto E. Sommer
17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland

LITERATURE SURVEY

A REVIEW OF RECENT THEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS

PUBLISHED AS A SUPPLEMENT TO LUTHERAN WORLD BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY
OF THE LUTHERAN WORLD FEDERATION

DECEMBER

1959

Biblical Theology

PSALM 89. *Eine Liturgie aus dem Ritual des leidenden Königs. (A Liturgy from the Ritual of a Suffering King)* by G. W. Ahlström, C. W. K. Gleerup Förlag, Lund, 1959. 228 pp. Skr. 25.

The author has dedicated himself to the task of making a contribution to the problem of the sacred kingdoms through this exegetical study of Psalm 89 from the standpoint of textual criticism, the history of tradition and religious phenomena. The material in the Psalms is of decisive importance to this circle of questions. In the introduction the author deals with the problem of the historical tradition of the Psalms; in his opinion the definition of the type and the "place of the psalm in life" must derive from the content of the Psalms themselves. At the end he investigates the concept *maskil*, coming to the conclusion that it has to do not with a designation for wisdom and teaching Psalms, but is a term for a special liturgical collection whose main motif is the problem of life and death. Therefore we have to do here with an annual festival Psalm, which belongs to the ritual of the renewal of life.

The main part of this work consists of a running commentary on the text, analyzing both its language and content. The author deals specifically here with the question of the various forms taken by the Israelitic conception of God, the relationship between law and cult, psalms and prophets, the Ebed-Jahweh problem and the ideological concept of the King. References to non-Israelite religions are also taken into consideration. The author is of the opinion that the Psalm is a liturgy which falls into more than one part. The first verses (2-5) contain the prayer

of the king and the answer of Jahweh which follows it. In verses 6-19, we have a hymn which expresses the jubilation of the festival and its processional, which is followed in verses 20-38 by an oracle on the enthroning of the king. The conclusion of the Psalm contains the complaint (verses 39-46) and the prayer (verses 47-53) of the king in which he takes on the role of the suffering servant of God. The investigation of the concept Dwd concludes that at particular times the god of vegetation (Dwd) played an important role and was symbolized by the king in the cultic practices.

MATTHEW: APOSTLE AND EVANGELIST. *By Edgar J. Goodspeed. Philadelphia: John C. Winston Company, 1959. 166 pp. \$3.50.*

Dr. Goodspeed, retiring chairman of the New Testament Department at the University of Chicago and the author of a large number of books, now makes a contribution to the discussion of the authorship of the Gospel of Matthew. In the present book the author seeks to show that authorship of the first Gospel by Matthew the apostle is not as untenable as A. H. McNeile, e.g., thought it was. For Dr. Goodspeed the argument is cumulative in its force but it might be suggested that there are three aspects to the argument which are dominant. First there is the high estimate which Jesus had of the book of Isaiah and correspondingly the place which Isaiah has in the first Gospel. There are similar situations in the time of Isaiah and the time of Jesus. Second, there is the position of tax collector which Matthew held when he was met and called by Jesus. Evidences of this fact are to be seen in several places in the Gospel. The third important part of the argument is the place and function of the tradition concerning the Matthean authorship.

The fact that the church has an unbroken tradition about the Matthean authorship of the first Gospel demands some kind of consideration. In a revision of an earlier judgment, Dr. Goodspeed concludes for the authorship by Matthew.

A LIGHT TO THE NATIONS. *An Introduction to the Old Testament.* By Norman K. Gottwald, New York, Harper & Bros., 1959. XXIV + 615 pp. \$6.50.

Recent attempts have been made by American scholars to produce treatments of the Old Testament which combine in new ways the results of the various disciplines of Old Testament study. Among these are Wright's *Biblical Archaeology*, Kraeling's *Bible Atlas*, B. W. Anderson's *Understanding the Old Testament*, and now Gottwald's extensive work. The professor from Andover Newton Theological School has written a historical survey of the Hebrews, consolidating in it, in a rather popular way, discussion of historical and archaeological investigation, literary-critical arguments, and coverage of the history and content of the religion of Israel and of the books in the Old Testament.

Gottwald's point of view may be illustrated by the following. His literary reconstruction relies heavily on oral tradition, but he does not give up the distinctions between J, E, D, and P. He assumes that there were actual persons, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, whether or not they were related as father, son, and grandson. He is not "uniformly negative or positive" about the trustworthiness of Genesis, and believes that it "contains a genuine but not absolute value for historians." Habakkuk is regarded as a temple singer and liturgist, and the book of Habakkuk as a cult prophecy intended for recitation in the Jerusalem temple.

DAS EVANGELIUM NACH MARKUS. *(The Gospel According to St. Mark.) Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament II.* By Walter Grundmann Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1959. XIV. 330 pp. DM 14.80.

Grundmann's commentary on Mark follows the *Commentary on Galatians* by Oepke which was reported in *Literature Survey* 1958 and represents a further step in the second edition of this series of commentaries. The author, who is known for his book *The History of Jesus Christ* has, with the aid of the

first edition of 1928 by F. Hauck, written a completely new work which takes the results of the latest research into consideration. The uniqueness of this volume lies in its taking both historical-critical research and contemporary theological exegesis into equal consideration. As an example of the author's achievement, his very relevant division of the contents may be cited, for example, 4:35-5:43 "The Lord Over All"; 6:1-44 "The End of Jesus' Activity in Galilee" 6:45-8:26 "Faithfulness to the Disciples Who do not Understand, Conflict with the Leaders of Israel, and the Approach to the Heathen" (other commentaries colorlessly call 6:1-8, 26 "Scattered Reports"); 8:27-10:52, the difficult material containing Jesus' intimations of his suffering are not called "scattered sayings" but "Intimations of His Passion and the Instruction of the Disciples." The accent on the "Gospel" in the title corresponds to the inner relationship of all of the events of the "history of Jesus Christ according to Mark" to the joyous proclamation of his victory and its effect on the disciples. The introduction §§ 1-5 and the fourteen excursuses are of great importance.

NEUTESTAMENTLICHE APOKRYPHEN IN DEUTSCHER ÜBERSETZUNG.

(The New Testament Apocrypha in German), 3. completely new edition. By Edgar Hennecke. Edited by Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Volume I, *The Gospels.* J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1959. 377 pp. DM 24.

The present volume which contains the apocryphal Gospels and the non-biblical tradition is a completely new edition. It differs materially from the second edition in that it takes the new papyrus found at Nag Hamadi into consideration, which was reworked by Prof. H. Ch. Puech, Paris. In its new edition this work continues in the tradition of the older "Hennecke" both in its formation of the text and in the scientific introduction and notes. The detailed main section on the question "canonical or apocryphal," on the history of the New Testament canon, on the origin of the apocrypha and on the history of the discovery of the apocryphal literature was written by the editor himself and presents an inclusive survey of the present condition of the research work concerning the apocrypha. The second volume, which will deal with the acts of the apostles, should follow shortly.

DIE AUFERSTEHUNG JESU: (*The Resurrection of Jesus*). By Gerhard Koch. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. 338 pp. DM 29.40.

In the light of the many-sided problems raised by modern theology in regard to the resurrection of Christ the author attempts here to survey the entire area. He wants to arrive at a *theologia resurrectionis* which will contemplate "what it means for mankind that the risen Lord claims men and takes men as the children of God into his saving nearness. The course of its reflection follows this experience" (p. 22). In the first section of his investigation he deals with the "Easter message of the New Testament" (the resurrection accounts and the biblical witness to the resurrection) and then in the second section with the understanding of the resurrection in modern theology (Schleiermacher, Herrmann, Kähler, Barth and Bultmann). This deals essentially with the real presence of Christ and with the task of correlating past historical events with present realities (p. 151). The interpretation of the Easter experience is decisive: The reality of Jesus Christ can only be experienced in the encounter with the reality and truth of his resurrection (p. 155). The "reality of the resurrection," the empty tomb, post-resurrection appearances, the physical presence and nearness of the crucified one—these are the important catchwords under which the author investigates the Easter experience before he deals with the "Truth of the Resurrection Event" (in Part V). This whole question is essentially bound up with the question of the real presence of Christ in worship as the experience of the drawing near of *Deus ad nos*.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AS THE WORD OF GOD. By Sigmund Mowinckel. Nashville, Abingdon Press, 1959. 144 pages. \$2.75.

This is the English translation, by Reidar B. Bjornard, of the 1938 Norwegian publication of a series of lectures by Prof. Mowinckel to a non-theological audience. The author's principle emphasis is that revelation of God is "a history of revelation"; "history of revelation in reality is also history of salvation." Because of history's "once-ness," the Old Testament is revelation in a more special sense than any other ancient history. Revelation occurred to Israel in historical events. The canon is even thereby revelation, for it

was formed in this process of history. One must also remember that between the Old and New Testaments there exists a double organic relationship: a conscious break and a conscious connection.

Mowinckel points out that revelation is also testimony, both proclamation and witnessing. Examples are given of poetry, myth, and legend understood as word of God in the Old Testament. The word itself is described as concrete, living, real, and relevant. It is revelation of God himself, and Christ is the incarnation of this. Mowinckel discusses Jesus' use of the Old Testament as the word of God, and concludes that the Old Testament in reality *treibet Christum*.

ST. STEPHEN AND THE HELLENISTS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. By Marcel Simon. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 130 pp.

In this small book, the Dean of the Faculty of Letters, University of Strasbourg, seeks to deal with the questions raised by the account of Stephen in Acts 6 and 7. This discussion constituted The Haskell Lectures, delivered at the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, 1956. Simon suggests that the term "Hellenists," as used by the Jews, was a disparaging term applied to those who "strayed from the ways of Pharisaic orthodoxy and could be labelled as 'paganizing.'" The speech of Stephen is said to express the Hellenist tradition of thought and to conflict with the basic attitude of Acts toward the history of Israel. Jesus and Stephen are thus seen to be not revolutionary preachers but religious reformers. Stephen seeks to demonstrate that Jesus is a prophet like unto Moses, and while there is no indication that he understood anything of a spiritual temple, his condemnation of the existing temple is independent of his Christology. Stephen is a revolutionary only in regard to traditional Judaism and not in comparison with the newness of the Christian message, though he does provide impetus for further development in the church.

DARIUS THE MEDE: A STUDY IN HISTORICAL IDENTIFICATION. By John C. Whitcomb, Jr. Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959. X + 84 pages. \$2.75.

This monograph seeks to show that Darius the Mede in the book of Daniel can be identi-

fied with Gubaru, or Gobryas, governor of Babylon during the reign of Cyrus the Great. On the basis of the Nabonidus Chronicle, Prof. Whitcomb emphasizes the distinction between *Ugbaru*, or Gobryas, the governor of Gutium who led the Persians into Babylon on Tishiri 16, 539, and *Gubaru*, or Gobryas, the governor of southern Babylonia (Scheil text) and of Akkad and Ebir nari, whose name is frequently mentioned in business documents from the time of Cyrus and Cambyes. The references in Daniel to Darius the Mede are drawn together and compared with the cunieform evidence on Gubaru. A special chapter deals with Rowley's objections to this identification, especially with the view that Gobryas was not a king and could not be called a king. The author argues against identifying Darius the Mede with Cambyes, and against Wiseman's recent suggestion that Darius was in fact Cyrus the Persian. He also disputes the thesis that Darius the Mede was a "conflation of confused traditions."

Historical Theology

POTESTAS ET CARITAS: *Die päpstliche Gewalt im Spätmittelalter. (Papal Power in the Late Middle Ages).* By Ludwig Buisson. Böhlau Verlag, Köln und Graz, 1958. 448 pp. DM 34.

To investigate the papacy of the late Middle Ages from the perspective of church law is the task to which this inaugural dissertation of the Marburg scholar is dedicated. The authority of the popes was in no way as unlimited as it may appear to have been. On the one hand it was restricted by the decrees of the secular rulers and on the other it was subject to the then current discussions on canonical law. Important along this line were the "canonists," particularly the lawyers of the Bologna school, who were the official interpreters of the *Decretum Gratiani*. The work and thought of the canonists were often called upon in the investigation of many problems. The basis for all work in church and canon law are the so-called *Decretum Gratiani*, which remained the rule for the order in God's church. The author studies this edict and in conclusion describes the papal power in relationship to the general conception of law. Particular problems in regard to papal

authority arise with the question of the scandalum (Matt. 18:8 ff.) in the pope's relationship to moral law, his love for his neighbor, and in regard to the heretical popes. What does it mean when the pope, as representative of Christ, is heretical? The author presents the opinion of the canonists in a detailed manner; of great importance is the counsel and command of the *correctio fraterna*, which can also have the force of law as long as the Council stands behind it. The Bull *Execrabilis* opposed this view. Of utmost significance is the fact that there exists, in the opinion of the canonists, a legitimate right to refuse obedience to the pope. The canonists also develop norms concerning the oaths of kings, which even sanction opposition to the pope and the breaking of the oath of fealty to him when he threatens the general peace.

CALVIN: DER MANN, DEN GOTT BEZWUNGEN HAT. (*Calvin: A Man Conquered by God.*) Translated from the French by Matthis Thurneysen. By Jean Cadier. Evangelischer Verlag AG Zollikon, 1959. 240 pp. Cloth bound. Sfrs. 14.80.

The German edition of this biography of Calvin (French original: *Calvin - l'homme que Dieu a dompté* was published as a contribution to the Calvin Jubilee Year. The title implies the motif under which the portrait of a victor is drawn who, through the power of God and despite his own weaknesses, "was one of the greatest spiritual fighters." Worthy of mention is the fact that the author sees the conversion of Calvin as a step by step process which had begun in 1529 with the lectures on the writings of Luther and which became externally evident in his refusal to accept church benefices. Particular emphasis is given to the literary activity of Calvin. Characteristic quotations from the "Institutes" as well as from his statements regarding the doctrine of predestination are given along with the events which lead to them. A whole series of selected pictures, many of them contemporary prints, add to the value of the book.

AN ESSAY ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF LUTHERS' THOUGHT ON JUSTICE, LAW, AND SOCIETY. (*Harvard Theological Studies, XIX*) By Franklin Edward Cranx. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1959. 197 pp. \$2.50.

Professor Cranz, at Connecticut College, New London, Conn., is a specialist in the history of ideas and has published articles about the social and political thought of Augustine, Eusebius of Caesarea and Nicholas of Cusa. The book is a preliminary study to an investigation of the connection between Luther's social thought and the ancient-medieval tradition. The author shares the careful scholarship and humanistic interests of A. D. Nock.

Prof. Cranz's central thesis is that Luther's theology can be meaningfully interpreted as a cluster of ideas around the meaning of society. From 1513-1518 Luther operated with the traditional conception of the essential sinfulness of present society, full justification to come only after the resurrection. 1518-1519 represents the turning point. After 1519 Luther interpreted the spiritual realm as a present reality wherein man was completely justified before God in Christ and which permeated his life in the temporal orders. Man was just (justified) before God by passive faith and just (righteous) in this life by active faith, i.e., love. A further modification occurred in 1528-1529 when Luther subdivided the temporal order into three hierarchies of church, family and government. These were secular to be permeated by the spiritual, faith active in love.

WEGE NACH ROM. (*Ways to Rome.*) *Kritische Betrachtungen von Konversionsberichten aus dem 20. Jahrhundert.* (Critical Observations on Conversion Reports of the 20th Century). By Helmut Essinger. Michael Triltsch Verlag, Düsseldorf, 1958. 197 pp. DM 12.80.

In this Marburg dissertation the author, a young pastor from Hessen, investigates the motives behind the conversion of various contemporary personalities to the Roman church. For the Roman church conversion means return to the one, true church, but this phenomena of conversion only exists since the rise of various denominations and in general usage means transferring to another denomination. The author maintains that conversion is not only the changing of denominations, but implies a confronting of the question of truth, an experience which implies a critical position in regard to the church being left. The Roman church views converts as particularly responsible bearers of the "holy task"—to work for union, that is

to convert others. After these basic observations, the author turns his attention to the reports of individual conversions which were written in justification of the change-over to the Roman church. He studies the various types of conversions and lists four main motives: 1. The aesthetic-liturgical: individuals for whom symbolic-sensate things, perhaps the Roman liturgy in itself were the reasons for the conversion. 2. Church political: individuals who were impressed by the authority of the Roman church which presents something of a shelter and defense in these times. 3. The dogmatic-doctrinal: individuals who were converted because of the conviction that the Roman church possesses the fullness of truth. 4. Personal factors as motives: Individuals so impressed by their contact with Roman Catholics that they, too, turned to the Roman church.

LUTHER'S GUDSTRO. *En indførelse i Luthers tankeverden.* (Luther's Faith in God: An Introduction to the Thought of Luther) By N. Otto Jensen. G.E.C. Gads Forlag, København, 233 pp. D. Kr. 18.

This is a collection of articles and speeches concerning Luther which the author, a pastor in Jutland, formerly has published in the magazine *Tidehverv*. Through the use of an extraordinarily large number of quotations from Luther (translated into Danish), the author seeks to present the central thought of Luther (above all his view of the relationship between justification and sanctification, the work of the Holy Ghost, the authority of the law for Christians). He takes as his starting point the contrast between Luther's thought and the then-current understanding of man and of Christianity. With dialectical sharpness, and with the help of Luther's "De servo arbitrio", he contends against all that which belongs to the realm of piety, religious experience and work-righteousness. Of importance are also the two articles on Luther as preacher: "The True and False Church according to Luther." The book concludes with a Danish translation of the Heidelberg Disputation and a sermon of Luther's on Matt. 9:18-26.

LUTHERJAHRBUCH 1959: *Jahrbuch der Luthergesellschaft.* (Year Book of the Luther Society) Edited by Franz Lau. Volume XXXVI. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus 1959. 172 pp.

In the first article on the topic "Unanimity in the Doctrine of Justification?," Erdmann Schott (Halle) deals with the thesis of the Catholic researcher Hans Kung, that the doctrine of justification as maintained by Karl Barth and the Council of Trent are in agreement. The author presents a short sketch of Luther's doctrine of justification and that of Küng and concludes that the difference between the two can be traced to the concept of faith which each of them holds. In another article, Gerhard Pfeiffer (Nürnberg) deals with the "Struggle of the Young Luther over the Righteousness of God." After describing the traditional interpretations, the author turns to the testimony of Luther himself, coming to the conclusion that the Reformation breakthrough of 1518 must be sought long before the second lectures on the Psalms as his earlier understanding of the concept of *justitia Dei* shows. Erwin Mülhaupt (Wuppertal) writes about "The Permanent and the Temporary in Luther's Critique of the Papacy." To that which is temporary, the author counts the crude style, the somewhat sarcastic caricatures of the pope, and certain historical and exegetical themes. Among that which is lasting the author includes Luther's critique of the basis for the papacy and the manner in which the meaning of basic concepts was changed in the papal decrees. Reinhold Jauering (Weimar) reports on the "Competition between the Jena and Wittenberg editions of Luthers' Works." He reports the contemporary critique of the Wittenberg edition, particular that of Almsdorf, and summarizes the advantages of the Jena edition, the basic principles of which were also utilized in the Wittenberg edition. Hans Volz (Bovenden) writes on "Luther's View of the Old Testament Apocrypha." Luther held to the basic position of Hieronymus that the Apocrypha were not to be used in support of Christian doctrine, and therefore he appends some of them, but not all, and without numbering them, to his editions of the Bible. Besides that his position on the individual writings varied considerably. The last article, that by Franz Lau (Leipzig), deals with "The Peasant's War and the End of the Lutheran Reformation as a Spontaneous Movement." He proves on the basis of the history of various places in northern Germany where the Reformation was introduced by the citizenry, that it remained a People's Reformation even after 1525.

VON AUGUSTIN ZU LUTHER: *Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte. (From Augustine to Luther: Essays in Church History.)* By Walther von Loewenich. Luther-Verlag, Witten 1959. 440 pp. Cloth DM 16.80.

The Erlangen church historian has followed his book *Glaube, Kirche, Theologie* with this second volume of miscellaneous essays. The title is more than just a means of naming the two figures with whom von Loewenich has intensively occupied himself; it also includes a program: the course of church history runs from Augustine to Luther and from the Father of the ancient church to the Reformer there are many lines which can be traced. The personal tendencies of the author color this study. He finds in Luther a very modern answer to the basic question of man before God which cannot be ignored. This is made particularly evident in the two essays "The New Elements in Luther's concept of the State" and "The Reformation—Doom or Blessing for German History?" Through all of this the author makes a constant effort to avoid an uncritical dependence upon Luther and fights against the tendencies to venerate him as an evangelical "saint." An essay on "Thoughts on Evangelical Music of the Passion" completes the volume and shows how broad the scope of the author's research is.

LUTHER DEUTSCH: *Die Werke Martin Luther's in neuer Auswahl für die Gegenwart. (A Contemporary Selection of the Works of Martin Luther.)* Edited by Kurt Aland. Volume 10: *Die Briefe. (The Letters)* Ehrenfried Klotz Verlag, Stuttgart, 1959. 440 pp. Cloth DM 19.20. Subscription 15.40.

This selection of the Letters marks the first volume of the main series in this new edition of Luther's works (A previous volume, the Luther-Lexicon, appeared earlier). The selected 350 letters represent all phases of the Reformer's life and are presented in a very readable and at the same time exact translation. A short introduction and copious bibliographical notes on the recipients of the letters introduce the reader to the background of the individual letters. In any selection there is a difference of opinion as to the basis on which it should be made. Much is missed and perhaps a few things could have been omitted. However, in this case, the editor had to try to present a well-rounded picture of the life

and thought of the Reformer within the limitations set for him, for what are 350 out of Luther's many letters!

THE MATURE LUTHER. *Martin Luther Lectures Volume III. Theodore G. Tappert, Willem J. Kooiman, Lowell C. Green. Decorah, Iowa: Luther College Press, 1959. 179 pp. \$3.00.*

This third volume continues the usual pattern of nine lectures, three by each lecturer, Dr. Tappert of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Dr. Kooiman of the University of Amsterdam and Dr. Green, pastor in South Dakota. Dr. Tappert's first lecture "The Professor and His Students," draws on some of the monograph literature on medieval university life to supplement Luther's own remarks. It shows Luther as a pastor to his students. The second lecture, "The Theologian and the Study of History," deals with the problem of divine omnipotence, historical evil and contingency; historical purpose in the light of God's purpose. Dr. Tappert develops the chapter largely in terms of the 1525 treatise on the Bondage of the Will and the three hierarchies of church, home and civil government. He finds that the purpose of historical life is love for the one's neighbor. In the third lecture, "The Professor of Theology," Dr. Tappert reveals that the reform of theological education at Wittenberg consisted largely in the substitution of philology for philosophy. Dr. Kooiman's first lecture, "Luther at Home," draws primarily from the *Table Talk* and the later letters and develops Luther's understanding of the meaning of the home in terms of the three hierarchies, civil government (the temporal order), the church (the spiritual order) and the home (where temporal and spiritual orders meet). "Luther as He Saw Himself," the second lecture of Dr. Kooiman emphasises the continuity between the pre-1525 Luther and the post-1525 Luther. The third lecture of Dr. Kooiman, "Luther at the End of His Days," skillfully sifts the historical from the legendary. Dr. Green's first lecture, "The Young and the Mature Luther," is guided by the interest of the late Dr. Werner Elert of Erlangen to sympathetically reinterpret Melanchthon as a leader of the Reformation. Dr. Green shows that Luther was led to see the true definition of justification by Melanchthon and he differentiates a religious awakening of 1513-1514 from a theological formulation of faith in 1518-1519. Dr. Green's second lecture, "Melanchthon in His Relation

to Luther," surveys the state of Melanchthon research and sketches his life. He shows that Luther and Melanchthon were attracted to each other because of their common interest in Occam. "The Renaissance in Lutheran Theology," Dr. Green's final lecture, pleads for a creative use of Luther's theology. He feels the most important contributions Luther and Melanchthon can make to contemporary American Lutheran theology are: the proper relation of philosophy to theology, the theocentric core of theology and the true understanding of justification as forensic, which is an insight traceable to Melanchthon (pp. 127, 165-167). Dr. Green concludes by offering far-ranging suggestions for the improvement of theological education especially mentioning linguistic training and the teaching of a coordinated Lutheran world view.

THE RIDDLE OF ROMAN CATHOLICISM. *By Jaroslav Pelikan. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1959. 272 pp. \$4.00.*

This book examines the riddle of Roman Catholicism from three aspects. The first part looks with historical perspective at the evolution of Roman Catholicism. Here the nature of catholicity is found to be expressed in the two poles of identity and universality. Through the tragic necessity of the Reformation the Roman church has lost its universality in its attempt to maintain its identity. The second part of the book looks at the genius of Roman Catholicism. Here the peculiar identity of the Roman church is examined in its organizational structure, its sacramental system, its popular piety centered in the Mary cult, its dogmatic adherence to Thomism, and its worship in the Mass. While the visible structures of the Roman church are overwhelming the real strength of Rome lies in the universal mystery it is able to maintain through its sacraments and liturgy. The third part peers into the future of Roman Catholicism by examining the theological issues that both unite and separate us from Rome. Because we have a basic unity in fact we have the obligation to seek its fulfillment, but reunion with Rome cannot be found by simple conversion or return to Mother Church. Dr. Pelikan suggests at the end that the universal theological system of Thomas be challenged with a Protestant reaffirmation of the universal theology of Schleiermacher! For this book the author received the 1958 Abingdon Award.

MELANCHTHON ALS AUSLEGER DES ALTEN TESTAMENTS. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik, Band 2 (Melancthon as Old Testament Exegete: Essays in the History of Biblical Hermeneutics, Vol. 2.)* By Hansjörg Sick. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen 1959. IV. 156 pp. Paper-back. DM 15.60.

In this investigation, which was prompted by a prize-winning work for the theological faculty of Heidelberg, the exegetical work and the basic hermeneutic principles of *Magister Philippus* are presented in detail. In the first part, which is dedicated to the early period (till about 1530), the theological presuppositions for exegesis are dealt with as far as they can be gleaned from the Old Testament commentaries. The second, covering the period from 1530-1540, deals with the basic principles of exegesis, including individual points. In the third part the author deals with the significance of the church as a hermeneutic key in Old Testament exegesis. Since the history of the church according to Melancthon already begins with Adam, he draws direct conclusions from the Old Covenant to the present. It is also increasingly obvious that his exegesis is highly colored by the dogmatic *Loci*, so that the uniqueness of the individual biblical passages is often lost. This serves to indicate that one can only refer to Melancthon as an "exegete" under certain conditions.

DER BOLSCHEWISMUS UND DIE CHRISTLICHE EXISTENZ. (*Bolshevism and the Christian Life.*) By Fedor Stepun. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1959. 298 pp. DM 15.50.

This book illuminates some of the spiritual and theological relationships which are necessary in understanding the Soviet state. The author seeks the ideological roots of Bolshevism in Russian history, and particularly in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church. In the last analysis he regards Bolshevism as a negatively predisposed renaissance of 17th century Russia, a form of government striving against all religions with an almost religious fanaticism; in the terminology of Dostojewsky—a demon. One of the reasons that things happened as they did was because Orthodoxy never really found her roots in the ancient world and therefore never made the necessary spiritual decisions. While she lived in the glow of Christ's presence in her liturgical life, the "Cäsaropapism" grad-

ually deteriorated before her eyes. The only protest of the church was the "Starzenist" movement which sought to preserve the mystical substance of the church and which led the fight against the secularization of culture until the 20th century. The fault lies with the isolationism of the Russian church fathers and the ancient doctrine of natural rights in the Russian church. By means of an analysis of Dostojewsky's "demon" the author shows that the Russian "intelligence" must be understood as a degeneration of Christianity. The renewal of Russian Christianity depends on whether or not the figure of Aloysia Karamazov will be realized as a messenger of the church sent to serve the world.

LUTHERSK AEKTENSKAPSUPPFATTNING. *Ein studie i den kyrliga äktenskapsdebatten i Sverige efter 1900 [Luther's Concept of Marriage: A Study of the Debate on Marriage in the Swedish Church after 1900].* By Olof Sundby. Stockholm: Svenska Kyrkans Diakonistyrelses Bokförlag, 1959. 343 pp. Sw. Kr. 25.00.

This study sets out to examine the discussion in the Swedish church since the turn of the century on the question of marriage. In view of the fact that the Swedish church is bound by the confessions to the Lutheran reformation, the author seeks to show the significance of this discussion for the Reformation's conception of marriage. To provide a basis for the answering of this question, chapter one is devoted to a thorough treatment of Luther's view of marriage, which is found to be oriented to the distinction between the secular and spiritual kingdoms. There follows, as a transition to contemporary discussion of the subject, a brief historical survey of the conception of marriage in Sweden from the Reformation down to 1915; it is this conception which the present marriage laws reflect. In part two the author examines the marriage law of 1915 and analyzes the criticism which theologians and churchmen have made of the law. He shows that such criticism often proceeds from a viewpoint which Luther labeled Enthusiastic since it had given up the idea of God's activity in the secular sphere. This viewpoint leads to a confusion of *justitia civilis* and *justitia actualis*, the latter being regarded as the only expression of God's activity in the world. On the other hand, one also encounters in the debate a secularized conception

of marriage which sees marriage as a contact fully at the disposal of the married couple. At the end of the book there is a summary of the contents in German.

AN ARCHBISHOP OF THE REFORMATION. LAURENTIUS PETRI NERICIUS. By Eric E. Yelverton. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959. XXII and 154 pp. \$3.25.

Written by an Anglican clergyman, this book is devoted to portraying the liturgical contributions of Laurentius Petri, Archbishop of Uppsala from 1531 to 1573, "since many of his contributions to the liturgy are to be found in the Swedish *Church Manual* of 1942." His spirit finds expression in the modern liturgical revival in Sweden. The author depicts Petri as manifesting certain similarities to his English contemporary, Archbishop Cranmer, in that he represented a *via media* both theologically and liturgically, but without Cranmer's Erastian tendencies, for Petri skilfully contended for the autonomy of the Church of Sweden without precipitating a clash with secular authority. His liturgical contributions culminated in his *Church Order* 1571, which, however, built upon and enriched the liturgical reforms and writings of his brother and co-reformer Olavus. Yelverton discusses Laurentius' liturgical achievements under the headings, "The Missal," "The Manual," and "The Ordinal," summarizing his views concerning the Swedish Mass, pastoral duties and rites, and the office of the ministry as set forth in the *Church Order*. His traditionalism in matters of liturgy and polity, combined with his loyalty to the principles of the Reformation, is evident throughout. Nine appendices, including the Mass of Olavus and representative excerpts from the writings of Laurentius, comprise one-third of the volume.

Systematic Theology

DIE GERECHTMACHUNG DES GOTTLOSEN. *Eine Dogmatische Untersuchung.* (The Justification of the Godless: A Dogmatic Study.) By Wilhelm Dantine. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1959. 144 pp. DM 9.80.

The author of this book is student pastor and lecturer in systematic theology in Vienna. He starts from a critique of the doctrine of

justification in orthodox Lutheranism. To be sure, the objective content of this doctrine is preserved with great energy, but yet it at the same time contains a narrowness of real consequence since it is essentially understood merely as the means of appropriating salvation, that is, in an applicative sense. Faith thereby approaches somewhat the Roman doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass, which is also a means of appropriating the once-for-all-time act of Christ. In his analysis of the biblical sources, the author begins with Romans 4:4-5, where he finds the forensic character of the doctrine of justification expressed. From here one catches a glimpse of the Old Testament, where the whole relationship between God and man is seen in terms of legal relationships. But the entire New Testament is the unfolding of the act of salvation by which man is justified. Above all else, the author deals with the relationship between Christology and justification: Christ must not be seen merely as the fulfillment of the justification which must be appropriated, but already "his teaching and preaching, his offer of grace, his granting of forgiveness is a function of that testimony with which he pleads the case of the condemned sinner before the judgment seat of God" (p. 70). Accordingly, all Christological affirmations find their center in the faith in justification. In the concluding section, "The *justificatio impii* as the Truth of Faith" the author contrasts his position with that of modern dogmatists who do not give the doctrine of justification a comprehensive role in their systems, such as Karl Barth, whose Christological monism he criticizes. For our author the doctrine of justification is the summary of the trinitarian activity of God and thus is, at the same time, "applied Christology." The result is that the doctrine of justification cannot be a second-place matter which follows the proclamation of a general doctrine of God: the God of the Gospels can only be proclaimed as he who justifies sinners in Jesus Christ.

DAS WESEN DES CHRISTLICHEN GLAUBENS. (The Nature of Christian Faith.) By Gerhard Ebeling. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 256 pp. Paper cover DM 8.00. Cloth DM 11.00.

This book by the systematic theologian at Zurich, Gerhard Ebeling, consists of a series of lectures for members of all faculties during

the Winter semester 1958-59. The attempt is made to understand this main theme of Christian doctrine from the standpoint of several over-arching perspectives of faith. Thus faith is viewed as a very personal thing: The act of faith cannot be separated from the content of faith; instead faith must be seen as an historical event in which man encounters the reality of God. Thus the author can accept without condition historical criticism, while at the same time maintaining that the Scriptures are the original document of faith, in that it is understood as the witness of this faith to Christ. The resurrection, according to the author, cannot be seen as an isolated, objective event, rather Jesus is here the witness to the faith in the power of God to resurrect the dead. "To believe in Jesus, and to believe in him as the risen Lord, are one and the same" (p. 84). According to its very nature, faith is the faith which justifies. Justification is not a special achievement, it is not faith in something! rather it is the acknowledgement of the power of God, as it is revealed in Jesus, the witness. Here man is freed from himself and from his own weakness, and participates in the might of God. Therefore the implications of faith for human existence must be expressed in a double manner: Faith is not an act external to the "I" of the person, but it occurs in the "I" of the believer. At the same time, faith is an event which is never in the possession of the individual. In the section, "The Place of Faith" the author maintains that faith, according to its very nature, can only occur in time, that is, in the world and not in any form of *Entweltlichung* for "through faith the world becomes what it really is, namely, the creation of God" (p. 211). Thus the author places faith in God as the Creator at the end, as the last and most difficult consequence of Christian faith.

ZUM HERMENEUTISCHEN PROBLEM IN DER THEOLOGIE. *Die Existential Interpretation. (The Hermeneutic Problem In Theology: An Existential Interpretation.)* By Ernst Fuchs. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1959. 365 pp. DM 17.20, cloth 21.00.

The chief concern of the author of this book, professor of New Testament at the Kirchliche Hochschule in Berlin, is to focus attention on the so-called existential interpretation in theology. Above all he seeks to apply Bultmann's concern in the area of exegesis to the

whole of theology. This task is served by the publication of this collection of individual essays which, however, have a common content, and represent an undertaking under the title "Glaube und Wirklichkeit" which includes everything from sermon notes to finished meditations. The main section includes 3 essays on "existential interpretation" (pp. 65-115) and two treatises on the hermeneutic problem (pp. 116-153). The author attempts to take up Heidegger's ideas on existence: the existential interpretation concerns itself with the structure of existence and not merely with historical or cultural occurrences. This must be particularly applied to the New Testament, which is generally viewed only in terms of historical events. Above all, Fuchs sees "de-mythologizing" as a method to interpret the New Testament existentially, as he shows by various examples. Existential interpretation is the "interpretation of existence according to the criteria of truth found in the singleness of the individual" (p. 89). It is primarily seen in terms of the understanding, but must go further than Bultmann's conception does (p. 99 ff.). On the hermeneutic question, the author declares, among other things, that the scientific understanding of the New Testament must at a certain point go over into an existential exegesis, a change-over which finds its basis in the existential interpretation. He concludes his observations with a list of hermeneutic principles and rules (pp. 152 ff.).

DAS GEHEIMNIS DES PAZIFISMUS: *Theologie und Politik der Kirchlichen Bruderschaften. (The Secret of Pacifism: Theology and Politics of the Christian Brotherhoods.)* By Erwin Gross. Stuttgart: Friedrich Vorwerk Verlag, 1959. 144 pp. DM 8.50.

The author has dedicated himself to the task of "questioning in a fundamental manner the correctness of the teachings of the brotherhoods, their theological understanding of the gospel, and the practicality of their political views." The author distinguishes between two forms of pacifism within the circles of the brotherhoods—a "mystical" pacifism (held by H. Vogel and H. Gollwitzer) and an "enthusiastic" pacifism (held by H. W. Bartsch). The book is consequently divided into two main sections. In his opinion the tendency of mystical pacifism to declare atomic weapons devilish and to see ethically neutral things as demonic stands in opposition

to Luther's concept of freedom. Because of its failure to evolve a responsible ethics, the author considers pacifism politically impractical and dangerous. He sees the main characteristics of mystical pacifism as biblicistic legalism and blind ideological politics. The author finds a great deal of "enthusiastic" (*schwärmerisch*) pacifism in the brotherhood sermons on "peace." In its mixing together of faith and politics in such a way that "knowledge is banned from politics and conscience is banned from faith" pacifism, according to the author, represents a real danger to both church and state.

INTERPRETING THE BIBLE. (*Biblische Hermeneutik*). By J. C. K. Hofmann. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959. 236 pp. \$4.50.

This translation of *Biblische Hermeneutik* by the Erlangen theologian is the product of the presupposition that his theological thought could be of real assistance in modern American theology. The significance of Hofmann, according to Otto Piper who wrote the foreword, rests in the fact that he expresses the exegetical problem in terms of Christian doctrine and religious experience in contrast to those of his contemporaries who attempt to solve it with the help of abstract rational principles. Thus he has presented a balance between the orthodox and critical schools in his correlation of the Bible with the history of salvation. Furthermore, Hofmann discovered the significance of eschatology some 50 years before Albert Schweitzer and thereby has made a vital contribution towards overcoming the historical relativism in theology.

AUTHORITY IN PROTESTANT THEOLOGY. By Robert C. Johnson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1959. 224 pages. \$4.50.

This is a study in theological method and authority from Luther down to present-day Protestantism. Carefully distinguishing the orientations of Luther and Calvin from the Scholasticism which both preceded and followed them, Johnson first develops the Reformers' fidelity to the word of God in Holy Scripture as interpreted by the inner testimony of the Holy Spirit. He then contrasts this biblical norm with the human experiential standards espoused by Schleiermacher, Sabatier, Martineau, and the whole liberal Jesus-of-history movement. The prophetic reactions of Kierkegaard and Forsyth are then

developed in terms of a renewed emphasis on the central authority of the grace of the gospel. Against this broad background, Johnson spells out three current influential approaches to the problem of authority: the "contextual" method of Tillich (New Being); the "scientific and normative" methods of Nygren, Aulen and Ferre (Agape); and the "confessional" stance of Barth (word of God). The author is professor of systematic theology at Western (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary.

BULTMANN UND DIE INTERPRETATION DES NEUEN TESTAMENTES: Konfessionskundliche und kontroversiologische Studien. (*Bultmann and His Interpretation of the New Testament. Confessional and Inter-confessional Studies.*) Vol. I, By Rene Marle, S. J. Edited by the Johann-Adam-Möhler Institute. Verlag Bonifacius-Druckerei, Paderborn, 1959. 206 pp. DM 14.80.

This work of the French Jesuit has now been translated into German from the Italian. R. Bultmann himself has commented upon the original French edition in the ThLZ 82, 1957, pp. 241-250 and has acknowledged that the author has a good understanding of Bultmann's theology. Bultmann's place in Protestant theology is described (chap. 1); the problem of myth and de-mythologizing is investigated (chap. 2); the questions dealing with existential exegesis are discussed (chap. 3); the understanding of faith (chap. 4) and the question of Jesus—his cross and resurrection (chap. 5) are considered. Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament, Glauben und Verstehen* and the series in *Kerygma und Mythos* provide the basis for the discussion. The author believes that Bultmann's method leads inevitably to Liberalism, which he—along with Karl Jaspers—sees as the "only genuine expression of Protestantism." Thus, as Bultmann has already said, not only is the Catholic position stated here in contrast to his own attempt, but to Lutheran theology as a whole. The author feels that in Luther's Christology "the theses of Bultmann are already contained in *nuce*."

THE NATURE OF THE UNITY WE SEEK. *Official Report of the North American Conference on Faith and Order.* Edited by Paul S. Minear. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1958. 304 pp. \$4.00.

This is the complete and official report of the first regional conference held by the Department of Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches. It met at Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, September 3-10, 1957, immediately following the Third Assembly of the LWF. The book has two parts. One deals with the conference in session and contains all of the messages delivered. The second part is the official report of the three divisions of the conference. The three main topics were, "The Nature of the Unity We Seek in Faithfulness to the Eternal Gospel," "The Nature of the Unity We Seek in Terms of Organizational Structures," and "The Nature of the Unity We Seek in View of Cultural Pressures." Lutherans took an active role. Formal addresses by Dr. Joseph Sittler of the University of Chicago and Bishop Hanns Lilje are included. Lutheran section leaders were Dr. Edgar M. Carlson, the Rev. Walter Kloetzli and the Rev. Henry E. Horn. Dr. Minear is Professor of New Testament at Yale University Divinity School in New Haven, Connecticut, and was chairman of the conference.

FREIHEIT ZUM LEBEN. *Grundfragen der Ethik. (Freedom to Live: Basic Ethical Questions.) Handbucherei des Christen in der Welt, Volume V. By Wolfgang Schweitzer. Verlagsgemeinschaft Burckhardtthaus and Kreuz Verlag GmbH. Stuttgart/Gelnhausen, 1959. 240 pp. DM 9.80.*

This book in the series "Handbucherei des Christen in der Welt" presents a general introduction to the basic problems involved in evangelical ethics. The author consciously takes the second article of the Creed and not the first as his starting point. He rejects any form of idealistic theology of orders and advocates a biblical ethic of situations. Since the Christian faith is not concerned with morals but with the proclamation of the Lordship of Christ, the center of evangelical ethics must be the cross and resurrection of Christ. This gospel, however, transforms the reality of our human social life with its orders (*Lex*) by the breaking through of God's command (*Nomos*) which confirms and cleanses. Precisely within the orders of human social life the Christian is freed to love with the intention, not to live the perfect life, but a life as worthy of a human being as possible. An intensive study of the social and sociological realities of our day is one

of the most necessary tasks of Christian ethics. For this reason three of the four chapters in this book concentrate on problems of a social-ethical nature (the family and marriage, work and property, life in the political world).

WHAT PRESENT-DAY THEOLOGIAN ARE THINKING. *Revised edition. By Daniel Day Williams. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. 190 pp. \$3.00.*

This is a revised and enlarged edition of William's popular handbook in which he includes theological developments since 1952. These include mainly the studies of the ecumenical movement, the new dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church, the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the impact of modern scientific developments, and the ongoing discussions on the theologies of Rudolf Bultmann, Karl Barth and Paul Tillich. After a brief survey of the contemporary theological renaissance, he reviews four key issues which are being re-examined by many Christian groups: authority of the Bible; the basis of Christian ethics; the meaning of Jesus Christ; and the form and nature of the church. The notes cover over 100 quoted theological works and a supplementary book list offers another 75 which are discussed but not quoted in the text itself.

Practical Theology

HERR, TUE MEINE LIPPEN AUF: *Eine Predigthilfe. (Lord, Open Thou My Lips. Aids to Preaching.) By Georg Eichholz. The second, newly written edition. Wuppertal-Barmen: Emil Müller Verlag, 1959. 532 pp. DM 23.50.*

This volume of preaching aids with meditations from the Epistles is a completely new book from the edition which first appeared in 1941. Because the task of interpreting the Scriptures is an ever new one, the editor has secured new writers for the various meditations. This is the main difference between this volume and volumes I and 3 of the *Predigthilfe* which have appeared singly in new editions.

The meditations themselves are not meant as a substitute for the pastor's own effort; they are merely meant as aids. As a rule, following a general introduction to the text

in question, the basic thoughts are lifted out, the context is studied and the commentaries of the church fathers and contemporary exegetes on the text are cited. In many of the meditations this is done in lexicographical fashion. In some cases the place of the pericope in the course of the church year is also commented upon.

CONFIRMATIO: *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Praxis der Konfirmation. (Confirmation: Essays on the History and Practice of Confirmation.)* Edited by Kurt Frör. Evang. Presseverband für Bayern, München, 1959. Paper bound. DM 11.20. Cloth DM 13.20.

At the world assembly of the Lutheran World Federation in Minneapolis in 1957, the International Commission on Christian Education was commissioned to do a series of studies on confirmation and confirmation instruction. On the basis of regional preparations, an international seminar is being planned which will be devoted to this subject. Already in October, 1957 a preparatory session of German theologians and educators was held and the presentations at this conference are printed in this volume along with the results of the discussion. The essay by Wilhelm Maurer *Geschichte der Firmung und Konfirmation bis zum Ausgang der lutherischen Orthodoxie* attempts to show that the medieval *Firmung* must be understood as the sacramental fulfillment of the sacrament of baptism whereas the wide-spread practice of confirmation in the Reformation churches, which goes back to Erasmus and which was taken over by Pietism and the Enlightenment, rests on the thesis that a supplement is necessary to baptism. Karl Hauschildt presents a survey of the *Geschichte und Diskussion der Konfirmationsfrage vom Pietismus bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (The History and Discussion of Confirmation from Pietism to the 20th century). Kurt Frör attempts an interpretation of "the basic theological questions in confirmation." His thesis is: the confirmation is determined by and constitutes the conclusion of a distinct form of catechetical training; it is a remembrance of baptism, but not the admission to the sacrament of the altar. The essay of Alfred Niebergall *Zur Problematik des Konfirmationsgelübdes* (On the Problematic of Confirmation Vows) calls for a complete rejection of these vows

and attempts to show that the subject involved in confirmation is the congregation. Comments "on the proper age for confirmation" are made by Karl Linke, who after due consideration of the theological reasons for a proposed reform, supports the retention of the present age. Joachim Heubach criticizes the new confirmation reforms in the VELKD, in particular, because the theological grounds for the prayer of intercession and the laying on of hands are not sufficiently clarified. In conclusion a summary of the lectures and of the practical conclusions is presented by Kurt Frör.

DIE KIRCHENTREUEN: *Erfahrungen und Ergebnisse einer soziologischen Untersuchung in einer grosstädtischen evangelischen Kirchengemeinde. (Faithful to the Church: Experiences and results of a sociological study of an Evangelical congregation in a large city.)* By Reinhard Köster. Ferdinand Enke Verlag, Stuttgart, 1959. XVI. 118 pp. 46 charts. DM 20.00.

This study grew out of a sociological investigation by Prof. Dr. Helmut Schelsky who has written the foreword. Its author, an Evangelical pastor, was a member of his seminar in Hamburg for a number of years. He presents here the results of a study of a large-city congregation which concentrates on the relationships and motives of those "faithful" to the church. Aside from all religious and ethical criteria, this group comprises all those who attend the services of worship at least once a month. In this category there are three groups: (a) occasional visitors (35%), (b) those who are loyal to the pastor (29%), (c) those who are faithful to the church (36%). The author also finds that different definitions of faith motivate the various groups: (a) the church as a moral institution. This group sees the church and her preaching primarily as representatives of the traditional morality. The church is viewed as the last representative of the former authoritative state. (b) The church as an ideological society. In this group belong those members who are influenced by Pietism and the various brotherhoods. In these circles—which represent the cream of the faithful—the tradition of the *volkskirche*, the church's officials and her system of government are regarded critically. A tendency toward the adoption of the official church position is observable here, however.

(c) The third group sees the church as an institution for constructive discussion of a religious-aesthetic nature and for social contact and concern for one another. All dogmatic ties are rejected in favor of the general external progress of the group. Under special conditions this third form can lead to faithful members who have a strong interest in the specific content of the church's message.

STAT CRUX DUM VOLVITUR ORBIS:
Eine Festschrift für Landesbischof D. Hanns Lilje—Abt zu Loccum—zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1959. (Dedicated to Landesbischof Dr. Hanns Lilje—Abbot of Loccum—on the occasion of his 60th birthday).—August 20, 1959. Edited by Georg Hoffmann and Karl Heinrich Rengstorf. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1959. 237 pp. DM 16.80.

This volume contains essays which were written by professors and lecturers who have come from the Hannover Landeskirche as a word of greeting to its bishop. Otto Eissfeldt gives an exegesis of "Psalm 121." He finds it contains, like Psalm 91, the exchange of conversation in the form of the "Ich-rede" of the believer and the address to him through the priest. Karl Heinrich Rengstorf contends for the value of historical tradition in *Weihnachtserzählungen des Evangelisten Lukas* (Christmas Narratives according to Luke). The story of the shepherds is unique and has no parallel in the history of religion. Mary stands in the center of the narratives and through her Luke illustrates what faith is. Hans Wenschkewitz writes on *Die Einheitlichkeit der synoptischen erzählenden Perikopen und ihre Bedeutung für die Verkündigung der Kirche* (The Agreement of the Synoptic Pericopes and their Significance for the Proclamation of the Church). He contends that—despite all form criticism—all the pericopes testify to the Jesus who acted then and still does today in the full power of His authority. In his essay on "The Colony of Heaven," Julius Bodensieck presents a survey of what the New Testament has to say about the congregation as an assembly of wanderers and strangers in this world. In the comparison of *Rechtfertigung und Gericht bei Paulus* (Justification and Judgement in Paul) Hermann Schuster sees the expression of the final paradox in Phil. 2:12. Peter Kawerau presents a survey of "Asian Church History" in the first centuries with particular emphasis on the Nestorian mission in eastern

Asia. *Trost bei Luther* (Luther as Pastor) is the title of a study by Erich Fascher, dealing with Luther as a pastoral counselor. The Luther who consoles, is the same who stands in need of consolation. Paul Althaus shows in *Martin Luther über die Autorität der Kirche* (Luther on the Authority of the Church), that Luther, although he acknowledged the authority of the church because of the direction of the Holy Spirit, could not accept its tradition uncritically because he at the same time knows something of the difference between the true church of Christ and the historical church which is caught up in sin. Hermann Dorries writes on *Geschichte der vocation zum kirchlichen Amt* (History of the Call to the Ministry) and shows the forces and motives which historically have influenced the entry into the ministry. In "Luthertum und Ökumene" (Lutheranism and Ecumenicity) Kurt Dietrich Schmidt contrasts two tendencies of Lutheranism: the universal concept which sees the true church wherever the word is rightly preached and the particularistic concept, stemming from Melancthon, which sees the church as *coetus vocatorum*. Hans-Werner Genischen presents a survey of *Auseinandersetzung von Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg mit dem Islam* (Ziegenbalg and Islam) and Ernst Sommerlath writes on *Die Katholizität der Kirche* (The Catholicity of the Church) which consists of universality, continuity and *Humanitas Dei*. In *Kolonialismus als theologisches Problem* (Colonialism as a Theological Problem) Walter Holsten concludes that colonialism and anti-colonialism are both attitudes which root in the Christian faith but have lost their relationship to Christ. Friedrich Delekat deals with concept and problems of political atheism in *Karl Marx (Begriff und Problemen des politischen Atheismus bei Karl Marx)*, and Georg Hoffmann investigates the possibilities and tasks of "an ecumenical direction in practical theology," whereby he maintains the necessity for an ecumenical practical theology. Karl Janssen investigates "Johan Heinrich Wicherns Predigtanschauung" (Preaching Perspectives of Johann Heinrich Wichern) and criticizes Wichern's theology on the ground that his view of the struggle between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of the devil does not allow for the absolution of sinners. Eduard Steinwand distinguishes between that "which is central and that which is peripheral in pastoral counseling" (*Zentrales und Peripheres in der Seelsorge*) by viewing it as a part of the

liturgy. Under the title *Liturgiegeschichtliches aus dem Lande Hadeln*, Christhard Mahrenholz investigates a number of interesting orders of worship of the 18th century.

FRIKIRKER OG SEKTER (*Free churches and Sects*) By Michael Neidendam. G. E. C. Gads Forlag, København, 1958. 337 pp. D. Kr. 38.

The fourth new edition of this book contains excellent illustrations. It is considered by many to be the chief work on free churches and sects in Scandinavia because it takes the various Scandinavian religious groups into consideration. This new edition makes use of the wealth of new material which has appeared in the Anglo-Saxon countries on the Methodists, Quakers, and Congregationalists. The contents of the book are more inclusive than the title implies because it also deals with Lutheran mission societies and the Salvation Army, which are neither considered as free churches nor as sects in Denmark. Most of the chapters are divided in the following manner: history, doctrine, cult, organization and mission. The book begins with basic principles on "the one church—the divided church" and concludes with a register of names.

BORN OG UNGE I DANSK KIRKELIV (*Children and Youth in Danish Church Life*). By Elith Olesen. De Unges Forlag, København, 1959. 324 pp. D. Kr. 20.

The author investigates the "early history" of the Sunday school and youth movements in Denmark between 1883 and 1906 and describes their difficulties and inner dissensions before they became the familiar phenomena which they now are in Danish church life. He comes to the surprising conclusion, in contrast to earlier books on the subject, that it was not the men who are generally depicted as pioneers in these forms of the church's work who laid the groundwork, but that the credit is due to two much less well-known figures: Axel V. Jakobsen, "Denmark's Robert Raikes" for the Sunday schools and H. F. Poulsen for the YMCA. According to the author the truth of the matter is that Ricard cannot be credited as being the "man who built the Danish YMCA," but only as the man who with great talent and industry continued the work of Poulsen.

THE STORY OF CHRISTIAN HYMNODY. By E. E. Ryden. Rock Island: Augustana Press, 1959. 670 pp. \$5.95.

The author of this book is well-known for his work in the field of hymnology and cooperated on the Service Book and Hymnal which was introduced into most of the Lutheran churches in the USA in 1958. Since the book generally follows the historical sequence, the hymns are explained in their proper context and origin. The book is divided into 5 main sections: Part I, "Early Christian Hymns" presents an outline of the origin of the Psalms as well as the treasure of Christian hymnody in the ancient church down to the Latin lyrics and sequences of the Middle Ages. Part II gives a survey of German hymns of the Reformation and Part III deals with the parallel development in Scandinavia. The most inclusive, because they show how deeply hymnody is rooted in the American congregations, are the two last sections on English and American hymns. The book is also rich on illustrations of hymns in each category, the analysis of which leads to an understanding of the context out of which they come.

PREDIGTHILFEN, Bd. II. (*Preaching Aids, Vol. II*)—*The Epistles*. By Wilhelm Stählin, Johannes Stauda Verlag, Kassel, 1959. 589 pp.

This volume of *Predigthilfen* follows shortly after the one which the retired Landesbischof of Oldenburg wrote on the Gospels (*Literature Survey*, June, 1959). Here he also deals with the biblical texts in order, showing on which days of the church year they are to be used. The various sections contain a basic clarification of the context which is followed by a concise summary of the results of the exegesis. The theological background for the meditations makes up the largest part of the book. The accompanying register allows one to survey the place of the texts in the church year.

Correction

On page 12, col. 2, line 21, of the September issue of *Literature Survey*, in the review of *Studier Tillägnade Hjalmar Lindroth*, the reviewer has brought the following correction to the attention of the Department of Theology: instead of the word "transubstantiation" in the phrase "the history of the concept of transubstantiation" the text should read "the history of the concept of *metanoia*."

LITERATURE SURVEY is published as appendix to LUTHERAN WORLD. It is edited by the Department of Theology, Lutheran World Federation, Director Dr. Vilmos Vajta. The contributors to this issue were: Albert Anderson, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Horst Beintker, Greifswald; Eugene L. Fevold, St. Paul, Minnesota; Wesley J. Fuerst, Fremont, Neb.; Ragnar Holte, Uppsala; Paul Henning Jørgensen, Kongerslev; Ernst W. Kohls, Münster; Kent S. Knutson, Minneapolis, Minnesota; William H. Lazareth, Philadelphia, Pa.; Jürgen Roloff, Geneva; Robert Paul Roth, Columbia, S.C.; Adolf Sperl, Munich; Hans H. Weissgerber, Allendorf/Lahn; Donald Ziemke, Princeton, N. J.; Klaus Zimmermann, Erlangen; Wolfram Zoller, Tübingen.

All inquiries should be forwarded to: Department of Theology of LWF, 17 Route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.

Subscriptions are payable in advance and may be sent to any of the following addresses:

ARGENTINA	1 year	\$1.70	The Rev. Levon H. Spath
	2 years	\$3.—	Casilla Correo 118, Azul - F.C.N.G. - Roca
	(or equivalent)		
AUSTRALIA	1 year	18 Austr. s.	Lutheran Book Depot
	2 years	32 Austr. s.	19 O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, S.A.
BRITISH GUIANA	1 year	BWI \$3.50	The Rev. Aubrey R. Bowen
	2 years	BWI \$6.25	Buxton Village, E. C. Demerara
CANADA	1 year	\$2.75	Canadian Lutheran Council
	2 years	\$5.—	308 Kennedy Street, Winnipeg 2, Manitoba
DENMARK	1 year	D. Kr. 13.—	The Rev. Arne Thomsen
	2 years	D. Kr. 22.—	Vendersgade 28, Copenhagen K
ETHIOPIA	1 year	Eth. \$5.—	The Rev. Herbert Schaeffer
	2 years	Eth. \$9.—	American Lutheran Mission, Box 1899 Addis Ababa
GERMANY	1 year	DM 8.80	Lutheran World
			17 route de Malagnou, Geneva
HONG KONG and TAIWAN	1 year	HK \$10.—	Lutheran Literature Society
	2 years	HK \$18.—	33 Granville Road, Kowloon, Hong Kong
ICELAND	1 year	I. Kr. 30.—	
	2 years	I. Kr. 54.—	
INDIA	1 year	9 Rupees	The Christian Literature Society
	2 years	16 Rupees	Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras 3
INDONESIA	1 year	\$1.75	The Rev. Gerhard Reitz
	2 years	\$3.—	c/o Nommensen University,
	(or equivalent)		Pematang Siantar, Sumatra
JAPAN	1 year	700 Yen	Lutheran Literature Society
	2 years	1200 Yen	11, 1 Chome, Iida Machi, Chiyoda Ku, Tokyo
LIBERIA	1 year	Lib. \$1.75	Mr. James McKay
	2 years	Lib. \$3.—	Lutheran Mission, Monrovia
MADAGASCAR	1 year	CFA Fr. 400	Imprimerie Luthérienne
	2 years	CFA Fr. 720	Avenue Grandidier, Tananarive, B.P. 538
NEW GUINEA	1 year	18 Austr. s.	Lutheran Mission Press
	2 years	32 Austr. s.	Madang, Terr. of New Guinea
NIGERIA	1 year	12 WA s.	Sudan United Mission Bookstore
	2 years	21 WA s.	Yola
NORWAY	1 year	N. Kr. 13.—	The Rev. Henrik Hauge
	2 years	N. Kr. 22.—	Røahagan 25, Røa, Oslo
SWEDEN	1 year	Sw. Kr. 11.—	The Rev. Åke Kastlund
	2 years	Sw. Kr. 19.—	Jakobsbergsgatan 19, III, Stockholm
TANGANYIKA	1 year	12 EA s.	Vuga Mission Press
	2 years	21 EA s.	P. O. Soni, via Tanga
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	1 year	12 SA s.	The Lutheran Publishing House
	2 years	21 SA s.	150 Bellevue Rd., Durban
UNITED KINGDOM	1 year	14 s.	Lutheran Books, Ltd.,
	2 years	25 s.	71 Edgware Rd., Marble Arch London, W. 2
UNITED STATES	1 year	\$2.75	National Lutheran Council
	2 years	\$5.—	50 Madison Avenue New York 10, N. Y.

If there is no agent in your country or area, subscriptions may be sent directly to LUTHERAN WORLD, 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland, at the rate applicable in your country or the country nearest you.

LUTHERAN WORLD also appears in German. All inquiries concerning the German edition should be addressed to: *Lutherische Rundschau*, Kreuz-Verlag, Lange Strasse 51, Stuttgart N, Germany.